

## IV—GENERAL ASSEMBLY—IMPORTANT VOTES AND CONSENSUS ACTIONS

Public Law 101-246 calls for analysis and discussion of “votes on issues which directly affected United States interests and on which the United States lobbied extensively.” An important basis for deciding what is an important issue is consistency with the State Department’s Strategic Goals. For the 58th UN General Assembly (UNGA) in 2003, 15 votes meet these criteria.

Section IV contains five parts: (1) a listing and description of the 15 important votes at the 58th UNGA (13 votes in the Plenary, one in the Emergency Special Session, and one in the Sixth Committee); (2) a listing and description of the 19 important consensus resolutions at the 58th UNGA; (3) voting coincidence percentages with the United States on these important actions that were adopted by votes, arranged both alphabetically by country and in rank order of agreed votes; (4) voting coincidence percentages by UN regional groups and other important groups; and (5) a comparison of voting coincidence percentages on important votes with those on overall votes from Section III. An additional column in the tables of important votes (parts three and four above) presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 19 important consensus resolutions as additional identical votes. Since not all states are equally active at the United Nations, these coincidence percentages were refined to reflect a country’s rate of participation in all UN voting overall. The participation rate was calculated by dividing the number of Yes-No-Abstain votes cast by a UN member in Plenary (i.e., the number of times it was not absent) by the total number of Plenary votes (98).

### IMPORTANT VOTES

The following 15 important votes are identified by a short title, document number, date of vote, and results (Yes-No-Abstain), with the U.S. vote noted. The first paragraph gives a summary description of the resolution or decision using language from the document (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs in the first paragraph), and the subsequent paragraphs provide background, if pertinent, and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions/decisions are listed in order by the date adopted, and then in numerical order.

#### 1. U.S. Embargo Against Cuba

**A/Res/58/7**      November 4      179-3(US)-2

Calls on all states to refrain from promulgating and applying laws and measures such as the “Helms-Burton Act,” whose extra-territorial consequences allegedly affect the sovereignty of other states and the legitimate

### Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003

interests of entities or persons under their jurisdiction and the freedom of trade and navigation; urges states to repeal such laws.

Background: The rhetoric that has characterized the debate of this resolution during its twelve-year history continued and even intensified at the 58th General Assembly. The “extra-territorial” application of domestic legislation was universally denounced, and it was condemned as a violation of international law and a detriment to international trade. Numerous speakers insisted that the United States and Cuba could resolve their differences only through negotiation and dialogue.

U.S. Position: The United States again voted against this resolution, emphasizing the trade embargo is a bilateral issue that is not an appropriate subject for UN consideration. This resolution constituted an attempt by Cuba to divert attention from its abysmal human rights record. The measures imposed by the United States do not constitute a blockade, as the embargo does not affect Cuba’s trade with other nations. Cuba remains free to trade with any other country in the world, and indeed does so. Moreover, U.S. law permits the sale of food and medicine.

The United States has offered to make changes in the embargo if thoroughgoing reforms take place, but the Cuban Government has shown no interest in carrying out practical economic or political reforms. Cuban President Fidel Castro remains closed to any political opening and continues to deny his people the most basic human rights. For its part, the United States continues to put pressure on the Castro regime to promote democracy and human rights in Cuba. Israel and the Marshall Islands also voted No; Morocco and Micronesia abstained.

## 2. International Convention Against the Reproductive Cloning of Human Beings

Motion to delay November 6 80-79(US)-15

Background: The Sixth (Legal) Committee considered two draft resolutions concerning a possible international convention against human cloning. Costa Rica introduced a resolution, which the United States cosponsored, that called for negotiation of a convention to ban all forms of human cloning. Belgium introduced a draft resolution that sought to ban reproductive cloning only, which would leave the door open for states to allow so-called “therapeutic” or “experimental” cloning.

On November 6, 2003, Iran, on behalf of the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), put forward a procedural motion in the Sixth Committee to defer consideration of the item for two years, until the 60th UN General Assembly, in order for its members to meet and consider this issue. Delegations that opposed the Iranian motion asserted that the threat of cloning must be addressed urgently before technology progressed further in this area. In addition, these delegations argued that if this motion passed, states would be

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

denied the opportunity to address the assault to human dignity. Delegations that supported the Iranian motion maintained that the international community needed more time to discuss the issue in order to reach consensus. Some also argued that any convention on cloning required universality and therefore it would be preferable not to put the two competing resolutions to a divisive vote. The Iranian/OIC motion passed by one vote, 80-79(US)-15. The Sixth Committee report to the Plenary therefore included the recommendation that the item be placed on the agenda of the 60th UN General Assembly.

On December 9, the 58th General Assembly Plenary considered the agenda items of the Sixth Committee, including the item on a draft convention on human cloning. The Plenary decided by consensus to place the human cloning item on the agenda of the 59th UN General Assembly, and adopted Decision 58/523. An agreement was reached between all parties to consider the item in one year, and thus neither draft resolution, both of which could still be voted on by the Plenary even though they were not put to a vote in the Sixth Committee, was put to a vote.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored the Costa Rica draft resolution, which advocated a ban on all cloning of human embryos, both for reproductive and experimental purposes. The United States does not distinguish one type from the other since both entail the creation of a human embryo. Moreover, “therapeutic” or “experimental” cloning involves creating and then destroying human life in the name of experimental medicine. The United States continues to support a comprehensive ban on human cloning. Since last year’s General Assembly, the number of countries supporting a total ban grew, by the U.S. count, from 38 to close to 100 (66 announced their commitment by cosponsoring this year). The United States felt that the large number of cosponsors for the Costa Rican resolution demonstrated growing momentum in favor of a total ban and remained committed to garnering additional support for a cloning ban by engaging in further dialogue with countries that are still considering their positions.

### 3. Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People

**A/Res/58/18**      December 3      97-7(US)-60

Requests the Committee to continue to exert all efforts to promote the realization of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, to support the Middle East peace process and to mobilize international support for and assistance to the Palestinian people. Authorizes the Committee to make such adjustments to the approved program of work, as it may consider appropriate and necessary in light of developments and to report thereon to the Assembly at its 59th session (2004) and thereafter.

Division for Palestinian Rights of the Secretariat

**A/Res/58/19**      December 3      98-6(US)-63

Requests the Secretary-General to continue to provide the Division with the necessary resources and to ensure that it continues to carry out its work as detailed in relevant earlier resolutions. Requests the Secretary-General to ensure the continued cooperation of the Department of Public Information and other units of the Secretariat in enabling the Division to perform its tasks. Also requests the Committee on Palestinian Rights and the Division to continue to organize an annual exhibit on Palestinian, in observance of the International Day of Solidarity with the Palestinian People.

*U.S. Position:*      The U.S. position on agenda items concerning the status of the Occupied Territories and the situation in the Middle East remains clear: the United States fully supports the creation of a viable, democratic Palestinian state, with secure and recognized borders, living in peace and security alongside the state of Israel. Particularly in light of Security Council Resolution 1515, which endorsed the Quartet's performance-based Roadmap as the way forward in the Middle East peace process, the United States believes that General Assembly resolutions that deal with the Middle East question should be consistent with the principles of the Roadmap and the Madrid Peace Conference of 1991. (The Quartet is a group comprised of the United States, the United Nations, the European Union, and Russia.)

The United States views with significant concern the continuation of resolutions on the Question of Palestine. The Division for Palestinian Rights and the Committee on the Exercise of the Inalienable Rights of the Palestinian People perpetuate the notion that one party to the Middle East conflict has rights but lacks accompanying responsibilities. These two bodies, along with the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices, cost the United Nations close to \$3 million a year. The United States will continue to withhold its share of the budget for those two bodies and the United States will continue to seek their abolition. On a broader level, perpetuation of these bodies is inconsistent with UN support for the efforts of the Quartet envoys to achieve a just and durable two-state solution to the conflict on the basis of the performance-based roadmap that demands actions by all parties.

4. Illegal Israeli Actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the Rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

**Res. ES-10/14**      December 8      90-8(US)-74

Gravely concerned at the commencement and continuation of construction by Israel of a wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, and underlining the unanimous opposition by the international community to the construction of that wall, decides to request the International Court of Justice to urgently render an advisory opinion on the following question: What are the legal consequences arising from the construction of the wall being built by

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including in and around East Jerusalem, as described in the report of the Secretary-General, considering the rules and principles of international law, including the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, and relevant Security Council and General Assembly resolutions?

Background: On October 14, 2003, the United States had vetoed a similar Security Council resolution, asserting the resolution was not a useful approach and was unbalanced. The resolution did not include a condemnation of terrorist bombings nor the groups that perpetrate them. On October 21, the United States voted against a non-binding UNGA resolution that demanded Israel stop and reverse construction on its security fence in the West Bank (144-4-12). As requested in that resolution, the Secretary-General submitted a report to the Assembly on November 28. In his report, the Secretary-General concluded that Israel was not in compliance with the Assembly's demand that it "stop and reverse the construction of the wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory." Arab delegations subsequently called for the vote on this resolution in an emergency special session.

U.S. Position: In the U.S. view, the path to peace is the Quartet Performance-based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict.

The international community has long recognized that resolution of the conflict must be through negotiated settlement, as called for in Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. This commitment was spelled out clearly to the parties in the terms of reference of the Madrid Peace Conference in 1991. Involvement of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) in this conflict is inconsistent with this approach and could actually delay a two-state solution and negatively impact Roadmap implementation. Furthermore, referral of this issue to the ICJ risks politicizing the court. It will not advance the court's ability to contribute to global security nor will it advance the prospects of peace.

U.S. policy on Israeli construction of the fence is clear and consistent. The United States opposes activities by either party that prejudge final status negotiations. However, this emergency meeting and this resolution undermine, rather than encourage, direct negotiation between the parties to resolve their differences. The U.S. position on one-sided, unbalanced resolutions has been very clear. They are unacceptable unless they take into account the complex security situation on the ground and include a condemnation of terrorist bombings and the groups that perpetrate them.

The United States believes that the General Assembly's focus on the legal aspects of the fence could well divert attention from the real priority on the ground of promoting the peace process. The United States, along with its Quartet partners, will continue to work toward the implementation of President Bush's vision of a two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict as set

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

forth in the Roadmap. The Roadmap is the way forward toward the goal of the Israeli and Palestinian peoples living side-by-side in peace.

## 5. Confidence Building Measures in the Regional and Subregional Context

**A/Res/58/43**      December 8      73-48(US)-46

Calls upon member states to refrain from the use, or the threat of the use of force, in accordance with the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations; reaffirms its commitment to the peaceful settlement of disputes under Chapter VI of the Charter, in particular Article 33. Calls upon member states to open consultations and dialogue in the regions of tension without preconditions; urges states to comply strictly with all bilateral, regional and international agreements, including arms control and disarmament agreements, to which they are party. Urges, in the context of confidence-building measures, the maintenance of military balance between states in the regions of tension consistent with the principle of undiminished security at the lowest level of armaments; encourages the promotion of unilateral, bilateral and regional confidence-building measures to avoid conflict and to prevent the unintended and accidental outbreak of hostilities.

Requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on exploring possibilities of furthering efforts towards confidence-building measures in the region; also requests the Secretary-General to report on this issue to the General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-ninth session an item entitled “Confidence-building measures in the regional and sub-regional context.”

U.S. Position: The United States voted No on this resolution due to concerns that it was an attempt to draw the international community into the India-Pakistan dispute. The United States and other member states questioned the motivation of Pakistan, which introduced the resolution. At the 2003 UN Disarmament Commission (UNDC), after three years of discussion, Pakistan had blocked consensus on the UNDC’s report on confidence-building measures.

## 6. Transparency in Armaments

**A/Res/58/54**      December 8      150(US)-0-27

Reaffirms its determination to ensure the effective operation of the UN Register of Conventional Arms; endorses the report of the Secretary-General on the continuing operation of the Register and recommendations of the consensus report of the 2003 group of governmental experts; recalls its request that member states provide the Secretary-General with their views on the continuing operation of the Register; reiterates its call for all member states to cooperate at the regional and sub-regional levels with a view towards enhancing and coordinating international efforts aimed at increasing transparency in armaments; and requests the Secretary-General to report to the

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session on progress made in implementing the present resolution.

U.S. Position: The United States is a strong supporter of the UN Register of Conventional Arms, and actively participated in the 2003 Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on the UN Register of Conventional Arms, which recommended, for the first time since the founding of the Register in 1992, substantive changes to Register categories. The 2003 GGE recommended expanding the Register to include [hu]man-portable air defense systems and artillery between 75 and 100 mm. The United States supported this important resolution to strengthen the Register, expressing satisfaction at the work of the 2003 GGE in ensuring that the Register is able to respond to the threats that are currently facing the international community.

#### 7. Assistance to Palestine Refugees and Support for the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)

**A/Res/58/95**      December 9      133(US)-0-35

Acknowledging the essential role that the Agency has played for more than fifty years since its establishment in ameliorating the plight of the Palestine refugees in the fields of education, health, and relief and social services; affirms the necessity for continuing the Agency's work, and the importance of its operation and services for the well-being of the Palestine refugees and for the stability of the region, pending the resolution of the question of the Palestine refugees. Calls upon all states to make the most generous efforts possible to meet the Agency's anticipated needs, including those mentioned in recent emergency appeals, and to support the Agency's valuable work in providing assistance to the Palestine refugees.

Endorses the efforts of UNRWA's Commissioner-General to continue to provide humanitarian assistance, as far as practicable, on an emergency basis and as a temporary measure, to persons in the area who are currently displaced and in serious need of continuing assistance. Strongly appeals to all governments, organizations, and individuals to generously contribute to the Agency and to other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations concerned, and reiterates previous appeals to augment the special allocations for grants and scholarships to Palestine refugees, in addition to their contributions to UNRWA's regular budget.

Appeals to all states, specialized agencies, and other international bodies to extend assistance for higher education to Palestine refugee students and to contribute towards the establishment of vocational training centers for Palestine refugees, and request the Agency to act as the recipient and trustee for the special allocations for grants and scholarships. Notes the success of the Agency's microfinance and enterprise programs, and calls upon the Agency, in

### Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003

close cooperation with the relevant agencies, to continue to contribute towards the development of the economic and social stability of the Palestine refugees.

Background: The Fourth Committee's adoption (109-0-54) on November 14 of this U.S.-sponsored resolution and the subsequent vote in the plenary marked an important success for the United States. Although the Arab Group abstained, forty-nine delegations, including the European Union, co-sponsored the U.S. resolution. Israel, for the first time, also voted in favor of this resolution.

U.S. Position: A key U.S. goal at the 2003 General Assembly was to reduce the number of one-sided Middle East resolutions. The United States was pleased with the Assembly's adoption of this resolution, which reflected strong support for UNRWA's work, among donors and the world community, in providing humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees. Adoption also affirmed the U.S. Government promotion of consolidating resolutions related to Israel.

## 8. Work of the Special Committee to Investigate Israeli Practices Affecting the Human Rights of the Palestinian People and Other Arabs of the Occupied Territories

**A/Res/58/96**      December 9      87-7(US)-78

Commends the work of the Special Committee, reiterates its demand that Israel cooperate with the Special Committee in implementing its mandate, deplores those policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people and other Arabs of the occupied territories, expresses grave concern about the situation in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (including East Jerusalem), requests the Special Committee to continue to investigate Israeli policies and practices, and requests the Secretary-General to provide the Committee with all necessary facilities and to continue to make available such additional staff as may be necessary, so that the Special Committee may continue its work.

Background: The United States, with its Quartet partners, remains committed to achieving President Bush's vision of two states, Israel and Palestine, living side by side in peace and security. In that respect, the numerous one-sided anti-Israeli resolutions voted on each year in the General Assembly are not helpful and inconsistent with UN support for the Quartet envoys' efforts to achieve a just and durable two-state solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

U.S. Position: The United States voted against this resolution because the Special Committee was given a biased mandate to investigate only Israeli practices and not the human rights abuses committed by the Palestinian Authority or other entities. In the U.S. view, this resolution did not further the goal of promoting peace and security in the Middle East, but rather served only to sustain the climate of distrust between the parties and to isolate Israel,



which exacerbates the conflict. In addition, since there is a Geneva-based rapporteur with the same mandate, this special committee is redundant and therefore not in keeping with sound UN management of its resources. The United States also found it regrettable that this Committee would spend its time and energy reflexively endorsing the same set of resolutions year after year for some thirty-five years, but do nothing to improve the situation on the ground.

## 9. Rights of the Child

**A/Res/58/157**    December 22    179-1(US)-0

Urges states to sign and ratify or accede to the Convention on the Rights of the Child as a matter of priority and urges states parties to the Convention to implement it fully; calls upon all states to end impunity for perpetrators of crimes committed against children; requests all relevant organs of the UN system to incorporate a strong child rights perspective throughout all activities in the fulfillment of their mandates; calls upon states to undertake to respect the right of the child to preserve his or her identity; reaffirms that investments in children and the realization of their rights are among the most effective ways to eradicate poverty; calls upon all states to develop sustainable health systems and social services; calls upon states to recognize the right to education on the basis of equal opportunity by making primary education compulsory and available free to all; calls upon states to take all appropriate measures to prevent and protect children from all forms of violence; calls upon states to ensure that children are entitled to their civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights without discrimination; calls upon states to criminalize and effectively penalize all forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse of children; and urges all states and all other parties to armed conflicts to end the recruitment and use of children in situations of armed conflict.

*U.S. Position:* The United States is committed to ensuring that the protection of the rights of children is integrated into U.S. foreign and domestic policy, and is constructively engaged in a wide variety of multilateral and bilateral activities that benefit children around the world. However, the United States voted against this resolution due to concerns about unqualified calls to ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child, as well as assertions in the resolution that the Convention must be the standard for defining the rights and protections to be accorded to a nation's children. The United States has repeatedly made clear that the Convention raises concerns under the U.S. system of federalism. The United States also opposed the resolution's calls to abolish the juvenile death penalty. Assuming that procedural safeguards and due process guarantees are in place, the question of capital punishment for juveniles for the most serious crimes is one that nations decide for themselves in exercising their sovereign rights to become parties to treaties and to enact and implement their domestic criminal laws and procedures. Finally, the United States objected to references in the resolution to the International Criminal Court.

## 10. Strengthening the Role of the United Nations in Enhancing the Effectiveness of the Principle of Periodic and Genuine Elections and the Promotion of Democratization

**A/Res/58/180**    December 22    169(US)-0-8

Commends the electoral assistance provided by the United Nations to member states, and requests that such assistance continue on a case-by-case basis, while recognizing that the fundamental responsibility of organizing free and fair elections lies with governments; requests that the United Nations continue its efforts to ensure that there is adequate time to organize and carry out an effective mission for providing such assistance, that conditions exist to allow free and fair elections and that the results of the mission will be reported comprehensively and consistently; recommends that the United Nations continue to provide technical advice and other assistance to requesting states and electoral institutions throughout the entire electoral process time-span in order to help strengthen their democratic processes; expresses appreciation to member states, regional organizations, and nongovernmental organizations that have provided observers or technical experts in support of UN electoral assistance efforts; calls upon member states to consider contributing to the UN Trust Fund for Electoral Observations; requests the Secretary-General to ensure that the Electoral Assistance Division and the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights can continue to carry out their mandates; requests that the UN Development Program continue its governance assistance programs; reiterates the importance of reinforced coordination within and outside the UN system in this regard; and requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its sixtieth session on the implementation of this resolution.

*U.S. Position:* The U.S. Government has been pleased by the increase in UN programmatic emphasis on democratization within member states. The U.S. Government sought to promote the work of the United Nations in election assistance and monitoring. The United States sponsored this resolution along with 87 other co-sponsors, and voted for it.

## 11. Globalization and Its Impact on the Full Enjoyment of All Human Rights

**A/Res/58/193**    December 22    123-51(US)-4

Recognizes that the promotion and protection of human rights are first and foremost the responsibility of the state; reaffirms that narrowing the gap between rich and poor within and among countries is an explicit goal as part of the effort to create an enabling environment for the full enjoyment of all human rights; recognizes that the costs and benefits of globalization are unevenly shared, affecting the full enjoyment of all human rights, in particular in developing countries; welcomes the report of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights on globalization and its impact on the full enjoyment of

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

human rights; calls upon member states, relevant agencies of the UN system, intergovernmental organizations, and civil society to promote equitable and environmentally sustainable economic growth for managing globalization, so that poverty is systematically reduced and international development targets are achieved; underlines the urgent need to establish an equitable, transparent and democratic international system in which poor people and countries have a more effective voice; requests the Secretary-General to seek further the views of member states and relevant agencies of the UN system and to submit a substantive report on this subject to the General Assembly at its fifty-ninth session.

U.S. Position: The United States voted against this resolution. As in the case of a similar resolution considered by the General Assembly in 2002, this resolution was adopted by a vote along North-South lines. The United States was concerned that the resolution did not recognize the complexities of the issues involved in globalization, including the benefits that globalization can bring. Some of the issues the resolution addressed would be better considered in other forums. The resolution did not recognize that national commitments to democracy, transparency and rule of law are more instrumental in promoting economic development than the international democratic system to which the resolution refers.

### 12. Situation of Human Rights in Turkmenistan

**A/Res/58/194**    December 22    73(US)-40-56

Calls upon the Government of Turkmenistan to implement fully the measures set out in Commission on Human Rights Resolution 2003/11 of April 16, 2003 and to inform the Commission before its sixtieth session of the steps being taken in this regard; to implement the recommendations outlined in the March 2003 report of the Rapporteur of the Moscow Mechanism of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and to work constructively with the various institutions of the OSCE and to facilitate further visits; to develop a constructive dialogue with the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and to cooperate fully with all mechanisms of the Office; and to grant independent bodies, including the International Committee of the Red Cross as well as lawyers and immediate relatives, immediate access to detained persons.

U.S. Position: The United States jointly sponsored this resolution with the European Union. The United States has noted the deterioration of the human rights situation in Turkmenistan as a result of a government crackdown on perceived sources of opposition after an armed attack on President Niyazov on November 25, 2002. This crackdown resulted in widespread reports of human rights abuses including credible reports of torture.

### 13. Situation of Human Rights in the Islamic Republic of Iran

**A/Res/58/195**    December 22    68(US)-54-51

Expresses serious concern at the continuing violations of human rights in Iran; the continued deterioration with regard to freedom of opinion and expression and harsh reactions to student demonstrations; the continuing executions (including public executions), in the absence of respect for internationally recognized safeguards; the use of torture; the continued restrictions on free assembly and forcible dissolution of political parties; the failure to comply fully with international standards in the administration of justice; the systematic discrimination against women and girls in law and in practice; the continuing discrimination against persons belonging to minorities, including against Baha'is, Christians, Jews, and Sunnis; and the continued persecution and arbitrary sentencing to prison of human rights defenders, political opponents, religious dissenters, and reformists. Calls upon the Government of Iran to abide by its obligations undertaken under the International Covenant on Human Rights and other human rights instruments; to respond fully to the recommendations of the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention; to continue to cooperate with UN mechanisms; to expedite judicial reform; to appoint an impartial prosecutor for the re-established Office of the Prosecutor General; to eliminate all discrimination based on religious grounds or against persons belonging to minorities; and to take all necessary measures to end amputation and public flogging. Encourages the thematic mechanisms of the Commission on Human Rights to visit Iran, and encourages the Government of Iran to cooperate with these special mechanisms and to respond fully to their subsequent recommendations. Decides to continue its examination of the human rights situation in Iran at its fifty-ninth session, under the "Human rights questions" agenda item.

*U.S. Position:* The United States cosponsored and voted in favor of this resolution. In its statement, the United States urged Iran to take the steps called for in the resolution. The United States also agreed with concerns that the regime-appointed Guardian Council of Iran frequently over-rides the decisions of the elected legislature and the will of the Iranian people. In this regard, the United States underscored its support for a paragraph on the Guardian Council's refusal to consider the elected Parliament's proposal to accede to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), noting the refusal was based on the text's focus on the need for democratic processes in Iran, and not on support for the Convention itself. The United States has expressed grave concern about the overall deterioration of human rights in Iran in 2003. In particular, the United States has noted the clerical regime's broad crackdown on public debate and dissent, and its use of such tactics as intimidation, violence, and imprisonment of opposition activists.

#### 14. Situation of Human Rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo

**A/Res/58/196**    December 23    81(US)-2-91

Condemns the continuing violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, particularly in Ituri and North and South Kivu; the persistence in the eastern part of the country of armed violence and reprisals against the civilian population; the massacres in the province of Ituri; the reported perpetration of acts of mutilation and cannibalism in the Mambasa region; cases of summary or arbitrary execution, disappearance, torture, arbitrary detention for long periods; the widespread recourse to sexual violence against women and children as a means of warfare; the continuing recruitment and use of child soldiers by armed forces and groups; the impunity of those responsible for violations of human rights and international humanitarian law; and the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Urges all parties to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to cease all military activities; to implement fully peace agreements and to cooperate with the Ituri Interim Administration; and to continue to respect their obligations as regards the implementation of the Transitional Constitution.

Urges the Government of National Unity and Transition to ensure that the protection of human rights and the establishment of a state based on the rule of law and of an independent judiciary are among its highest priorities; requests that several Special Rapporteurs of the Commission on Human Rights carry out investigation missions in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and decides to continue to examine the situation of human rights in the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the fifty-ninth session of the UN General Assembly.

U.S. Position: The United States voted for this resolution. The United States proposed, unsuccessfully, to omit a reference to the International Criminal Court (ICC) and called for two paragraph votes relating to the death penalty. With regard to the ICC, the United States expressed concerns about the trend in the UN General Assembly towards referring to the ICC in many resolutions that are unrelated to the ICC or its areas of competence.

#### 15. Provisional Program of Work for the Second Committee

**A/Dec/58/554**    December 23    167-3(US)-0

Approves the provisional program of work of the Second Committee for the 59th session as set out in the annex to this decision. Invites the Bureau of the Second Committee to continue its efforts in consultation with member states with a view to ensuring a more practical and coherent organization of the Committee's work, including the program of work for future sessions, allowing better focus, visibility, and participation.

### Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003

Background: In his September 2002 report, “Strengthening the United Nations: An Agenda for Further Change,” the Secretary-General made the argument that there are “far too many overlapping items, and with a frequency that is often not merited.” The Secretary-General identified the Millennium Declaration, the International Conference on Financing for Development, and the World Summit on Sustainable Development as “a comprehensive vision of what member states seek to accomplish,” stating that if activities are not relevant to the goals and priorities agreed at these conferences, or do not have the desired impact, “we must be willing to let them go.” Taking up this challenge in 2003, the United States sought to realign the Second Committee program of work with the three conference outcomes. However, the G-77 insisted that no items be eliminated from the agenda, and accepted only cosmetic changes to the Program of Work that would create linkages between the Second Committee’s traditional “macroeconomic” agenda items and the outcome of the International Conference on Financing for Development.

U.S. Position: The United States strongly supports the Secretary-General in his aim to focus the work of the General Assembly on the goals and priorities outlined in these recent major UN conferences, all of which contain important commitments designed to eradicate poverty and achieve sustainable development. The United States voted No on the decision to adopt a Program of Work that rearranged but did nothing to reform the Second Committee Agenda.

## IMPORTANT CONSENSUS ACTIONS

The 19 important consensus resolutions are listed and described below. All were selected on the same basis used in determining important votes discussed above, i.e., they were “issues which directly affected U.S. interests and on which the United States lobbied intensively.” For each resolution, the listing provides a short title, the document number, and date adopted. The first paragraph gives the summary description of the resolution, using language from the resolution (“General Assembly” is the subject of the verbs). Subsequent paragraphs provide background and explain the U.S. position. The resolutions are listed in order by dated and then in numerical order.

### 1. UN Convention Against Corruption

**A/Res/58/4**      October 31

Concerned about the seriousness of problems and threats posed by corruption to the stability and security of societies, undermining the institutions and values of democracy, ethical values, and justice and jeopardizing sustainable development and the rule of law, adopts the UN Convention against Corruption annexed to the present resolution, and opens it for signature at the High-level Political Signing Conference to be held in

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

Merida, Mexico, from December 9 to 11, 2003. Urges all states and competent regional economic integration organizations to sign and ratify the Convention as soon as possible in order to ensure its rapid entry into force. Decides that, in order to raise awareness of corruption and of the role of the Convention in combating and preventing it, December 9 should be designated International Anti-Corruption Day.

Background: The 71-article Convention was annexed to the report of the Assembly's Ad Hoc Committee, which had been negotiating the treaty's terms, scope, and monitoring mechanisms for nearly three years. The Convention covers topics that include public procurement, bribery, illicit enrichment, embezzlement, misappropriation, money laundering, protecting whistle-blowers, freezing of assets, and cooperation between states.

The Convention represented the first globally negotiated anti-corruption treaty and would likely be the first anti-corruption treaty applied on a truly global level. It was more comprehensive than any existing anti-corruption treaty, and, for the first time in any multilateral agreement, provided a useful framework for governments to cooperate in recovery of illicitly obtained assets. In addition to globalizing the requirements to criminalize bribery of domestic and foreign public officials, it also required parties to take a number of preventive measures, including the promotion of transparency in public finance and procurement.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution urging states to join the UN Convention Against Corruption. The United States hailed the new convention as a milestone achievement in the global effort to fight corruption and ensure transparency, fairness, and justice in public affairs. In the U.S. view, the accord was vital not only to the rule of law, but to the fundamental confidence citizens must have for representative government and private enterprise to succeed. The United States believes that the fight against corruption requires action on many fronts and that maintaining the partnership among the 130 countries that had developed this convention was crucial to success.

## 2. Improving the Effectiveness of the Methods of Work of the First Committee

**A/Res/58/41**      December 8

Requests that the Secretary-General, within existing resources, seek the views of member states on the issue of improving the effectiveness of the methods of work of the First Committee, to prepare a report compiling and organizing the views of member states on appropriate options, and to submit the report to the General Assembly for consideration at its fifty-ninth session. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its fifty-ninth session an item entitled "Improving the effectiveness of the methods of work of the First Committee."

Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003

U.S. Position: This resolution was sponsored by the United States and was adopted by consensus. The goal of the U.S.-led “Improvement Initiative” was to initiate a process to modernize the General Assembly’s First Committee so that it can effectively address new, 21st Century threats to peace and security. Adoption of the resolution without a vote demonstrated the broad appeal of this effort. The resolution was the first reform measure in 58 years to originate in and win approval by the First Committee, and the first to expressly refer to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks in the context of new threats to international peace and security.

3. Measures to Prevent Terrorists from Acquiring Weapons of Mass Destruction

**A/Res/58/48**      December 8

Calls upon all member states to support international efforts and to take and strengthen national measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction, their means of delivery, and materials and technologies related to their manufacture. Requests the Secretary-General to compile a report on measures already taken by international organizations on issues relating to linkages between terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. Encourages states to provide voluntary recommendations and feedback on additional relevant measures to be reported to the General Assembly at its 59th session; encourages cooperation among member states and relevant regional and international organizations for strengthening national capacities in this regard. Decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 59th session the item entitled, “Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction.”

Background: In 2002, this annual resolution for the first time focused the First Committee’s attention on the WMD/terrorist nexus and requested the Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on measures for deterring the global threat posed by terrorists’ acquisition of weapons of mass destruction. That resolution acknowledged the necessity for concerted national, regional, and international efforts to confront the WMD/terrorist threat.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on the 2003 resolution, which recognizes the urgent threat to international peace and security posed by the prospect of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists. The resolution again requests the Secretary-General to seek the views of member states on ways to confront the WMD/terrorist threat; the United States encourages all countries to share their ideas and accomplishments in this area.



#### 4. Safety and Security of Humanitarian Personnel and Protection of UN Personnel

**A/Res/58/122**    December 17

Deeply concerned by the dangers and security risks faced by humanitarian, United Nations, and associated personnel at the field level, urges all states to take the necessary measures to ensure the safety and security of humanitarian personnel and UN and its associated personnel and to ensure respect for the inviolability of UN premises. Calls upon all other parties involved in armed conflicts to ensure the safety and protection of UN and other humanitarian workers, to refrain from abducting or detaining them in violation of their immunity and speedily to release, without harm, any abductee or detainee.

Strongly condemning any act or failure to act, which obstructs or prevents UN and other humanitarian workers from discharging their humanitarian functions, or which entails being subjected to threats, the use of force or physical attack, affirms the need to hold accountable those who commit such acts. Expresses deep concern that, over the past decade, threats against the safety and security of UN and other humanitarian workers have escalated at an unprecedented rate and that perpetrators of acts of violence seemingly operate with impunity. Calls upon all governments and parties in complex humanitarian emergencies to ensure the safe and unhindered access of humanitarian personnel in order to allow them to perform efficiently their task of assisting the affected civilian population, including refugees and internally displaced persons.

Requests the Secretary-General to ensure that UN and other personnel are properly informed about the conditions under which they are called upon to operate and the standards they are required to meet and to ensure that adequate training in security, human rights, and international humanitarian law is provided. Invites the United Nations and other humanitarian organizations to strengthen the analysis of threats to their safety and security. Emphasizes the need to give further consideration to the safety and security of locally recruited humanitarian personnel, who account for the majority of casualties.

*Background:* In 2003, the matter of safety and security for humanitarian workers took on added poignancy with the August 19 attack on the UN headquarters in Baghdad, Iraq. The U.S., and UN's, commitment to the safety and security of humanitarian workers worldwide was also demonstrated by its support for Security Council Resolution 1502, adopted in August 2003, which recognized the paramount importance of the work of humanitarian and UN and associated personnel, and the need to protect them.

*U.S. Position:* Prior to the text's adoption, the Assembly voted to retain the thirteenth preambular and tenth operative paragraphs of the text by a vote of 149 in favor, 1 against (United States), with 8 abstentions. Both

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

paragraphs referred to the International Criminal Court, with operative paragraph 10 calling upon states to consider becoming parties to the Rome Statute. The United States joined consensus on the overall resolution, but it voted against these references to the International Criminal Court that were not merely neutral and factual.

5. Revitalization of the Work of the General Assembly

**A/Res/58/126**    December 19

Recalling its previous resolutions related to the revitalization of its work, and aware of the need to enhance its authority and role and to improve its working methods, decides to adopt the text contained in the annex to the present resolution.

The annexed text contains measures aimed at revitalizing the work of the General Assembly, amid concerns from member states that the actions of other UN bodies, including the Security Council, may be reducing the General Assembly's influence.

*Background:* Unlike the Security Council or the Economic and Social Council [ECOSOC], all of the UN's 191 members get a seat and a vote in the Assembly, which has faced criticism over its lengthy agenda, including its repetitive agenda items and protracted debates. With this resolution, the Assembly decided to take steps to increase its efficiency and attempt to raise its profile so that its decisions might have greater impact. The resolution included measures consolidating the annual agenda and fostering more interactive discussions. In response to member states' desire for a closer working relationship between the presidents of the Assembly and the Security Council and ECOSOC, the resolution called for regular meetings among the three presidents to better coordinate their work, and for the Security Council's president to brief the other two leaders on the Security Council's plans for thematic debates. The resolution also invited the Security Council to submit periodic reports to the Assembly "on issues of current international concern" and to improve the quality of the annual report it provides to the Assembly.

*U.S. Position:* While the United States joined consensus on this resolution and commended the hard work of the General Assembly President and his colleagues, it regretted that their efforts and commitment were not matched by those of the membership in general. In the U.S. view, this resolution, while moving forward, did not fully achieve the goal of revitalizing the work of the General Assembly. This resolution did not go far enough in the direction of the reforms required to truly re-energize the institution. The U.S. believes the proposal to extend the work of UNGA committees into the spring and summer will not enhance the body's effectiveness. The United States called on the membership of the General Assembly, among other things, to streamline the agenda, to require the General Assembly President to carry out his duties from within existing resources, and to consider any proposed scheduling changes with regard to accompanying streamlining and other

process reforms. The United States believed member states should have accepted bolder initiatives to revitalize its work, or risk the Assembly sliding into irrelevancy.

## 6. Strengthening International Cooperation in Preventing and Combating Trafficking in Persons and Protecting Victims of Such Trafficking

**A/Res/58/137**    December 22

Urges member states to employ a comprehensive approach to combating trafficking in persons, incorporating law enforcement efforts, and, where appropriate, the confiscation and seizure of the proceeds of trafficking, protection of victims, and preventive measures, including measures against activities that draw profit from the exploitation of victims of trafficking.

Recognizes that broad international cooperation between member states and relevant intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations is essential to effectively counter the threat of trafficking in persons. Urges member states to take measures to ratify or accede to the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, and the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the Sale of Children, Child Prostitution, and Child Pornography, and to implement those instruments by, among other things, (a) criminalizing trafficking in persons; and (b) establishing the offense of trafficking in persons as a predicate offense for money-laundering offenses.

Invites states to adopt several measures in accordance with their domestic law and capacity. Among them, to raise awareness, especially through training, among criminal justice officials and others, as appropriate to the needs of victims of trafficking and to the crucial role of victims in detecting and prosecuting this crime by, among other things: (a) investigation of all cases reported by victims, prevention of further victimization, and in general, treatment of victims with respect; and (b) treatment of victims and witnesses with sensitivity throughout criminal justice proceedings; to provide assistance and protection to victims of trafficking in persons, including measures to permit victims to remain in their territory temporarily or permanently, as appropriate; to promote the legislative and other measures necessary to establish a wide range of assistance, including legal, psychological, medical, and social assistance and, if appropriate, compensation or restitution, to the actual victims of trafficking, subject to the determination of the existence of victimization; and to assist in the reintegration of victims of trafficking into society. Further invites member states, as appropriate, to develop guidelines for the protection of victims of trafficking before, during, and after criminal proceedings.

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

Invites member states to allocate appropriate resources for victim services, public awareness campaigns, and law enforcement activities directed at eliminating trafficking and exploitation and to foster international cooperation, including adequate technical assistance and capacity-building programs, to improve the ability of member states to take effective measures against trafficking in persons. Further encourages member states to take measures, including raising public awareness, to discourage, especially among men, the demand that fosters sexual exploitation. Encourages member states to target the link, where appropriate, between trafficking in persons for purposes of sexual and other forms of exploitation and other types of crime.

*Background:* Every year, an estimated 800,000 to 900,000 human beings are bought, sold, or forced across the world's borders. This commerce in human life generates billions of dollars each year—much of which is used to finance organized crime. For this reason, this resolution requests UN member states to ratify the protocols and conventions relating to transnational, organized crime, as well as ones about trafficking in persons.

Trafficking in persons contributes to societal corrosion, threatens the rule of law and democracy, and generates millions of dollars a year. More significantly, terrorists are drawn to the infrastructures established by traffickers, such as document forgers, corrupt border police, money launderers, and access to weapons. Such a well-established infrastructure makes the underworld of transnational organized crime a natural partner for terrorists. This resolution highlights the importance of criminalizing trafficking in persons and making trafficking in persons a predicate offense for money laundering. It also highlights the needs of victims by promoting legislation and guidelines for their protection and calling for a greater allocation of resources for victim services, public awareness campaigns, and law enforcement activities directed at eliminating trafficking. In addition, it emphasizes the need to raise awareness among criminal justice officials of the needs of victims and their important role in detecting and prosecuting those involved.

*U.S. Position:* The United States joined consensus on this resolution. In addition, it has signed and is in the process of ratifying the UN Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime and the two Protocols. The United States is committed to eradicating trafficking in persons by vigorously enforcing U.S. laws against those involved. In his address before the 2003 UN General Assembly, President Bush called on world leaders to accelerate efforts to stop trafficking and pledged a U.S. commitment of \$50 million to support the global fight against human trafficking. The United States is actively partnering with other nations to combat this transnational crime, providing assistance to trafficking victims and striving to highlight the dangers of sex tourism and trafficking.

The State Department's annual, Congressionally mandated *Trafficking in Persons Report* will be issued in June 2004.

## 7. Women and Political Participation

**A/Res/58/142**    December 22

Urges states to: 1) eliminate laws, regulations, and practices that in a discriminatory manner prevent or restrict women from participating in the political process, and to implement positive measures that would accelerate the achievement of equality between men and women; and 2) ensure equal access to education, property rights, and inheritance rights, and to promote equal access to information technology and business and economic opportunities, including in international trade, in order to provide women with the tools that enable them to take part fully and equally in decision-making processes at all levels.

Invites governments, as well as the private sector, nongovernmental organizations, and other civil society actors to: 1) encourage political parties to actively seek qualified women candidates, to provide training in conducting campaigns, public speaking, fund-raising, and parliamentary procedure, and to include qualified women and men on their party lists for elective office, where such lists exist; 2) support initiatives, including public-private partnerships and exchange programs, to expand women's political skills, which include imparting or enhancing skills on how to vote, advocate, manage, and govern, run for public office, and serve as elected and appointed officials; and 3) encourage the media to recognize the importance of women's participation in the political process, provide fair and balanced coverage of male and female candidates, cover participation in women's political organizations, and ensure coverage of issues that have a particular impact on women.

*Background:* The United States has long advocated support for women's active participation in the political process as essential to successful democracies. As the United States said in its statement before the Third (Social and Humanitarian) Committee, "In a vibrant democracy, all voices are heard and issues of concern to women and men are addressed by a responsive and accountable system. Women too rarely contest for public office; this is one reason why so few women serve in elective office at all levels of government. Particularly in underdeveloped countries and emerging democracies, women are eager to understand the democratic process, but they face barriers that prevent their participation." The United States also made clear that governments and others in civil society should provide the tools for them to learn.

*U.S. Position:* The United States was the principal sponsor of this resolution, and its adoption was a priority for the United States at this General Assembly. It was co-sponsored by 110 nations and was adopted by consensus. The resolution recalls basic principles on women's participation in the political process, such as a woman's right to vote in all elections and to run for and hold office, and also proposes practical measures that governments and others

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

in civil society can take to empower women. The United States is now looking for governments and others to take steps to implement the resolution.

## 8. Elimination of Domestic Violence Against Women

**A/Res/58/147**    December 22

Strongly condemns all forms of domestic violence against women and girls, and in this regard, calls for the elimination of all forms of gender-based violence in the family, including where perpetrated or condoned by the state. Expresses its concern at the continued incidence of women as victims of domestic violence and at the continuing occurrence in all regions of the world of domestic violence, which takes many different forms, and at failures to prosecute and punish the perpetrators. Expresses concern that domestic violence, including sexual violence in a marriage, is still treated as a private matter in some countries. Stresses that states have an obligation to exercise due diligence to prevent, investigate, and punish the perpetrators of domestic violence against women. Calls upon states to adopt, strengthen, and implement legislation that prohibits domestic violence, prescribes punitive measures, and establishes adequate legal protection.

*Background:* The General Assembly met to take up the reports of its Third Committee (Social and Humanitarian). It adopted this draft resolution, one of six related to the advancement of women, unanimously and without a vote.

*U.S. Position:* The United States joined consensus on this resolution, asserting that the resolution and its adoption by consensus make a strong statement about a problem that has no place in civilized society. Paragraph 7(o) of the resolution calls upon states “to consider, as a matter of priority, becoming party to the Convention of the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).” The fact that the United States joined consensus does not represent a change in U.S. policy regarding the Convention, which is currently under review by the Administration.

## 9. Incompatibility Between Democracy and Racism

**A/Res/58/159**    December 22

Condemns political platforms, organizations, legislation, and practices based on racism, xenophobia, or doctrines of racial superiority as incompatible with democracy and with transparent and accountable governance; affirms that racism and related intolerance condoned by governmental policies violate human rights and that impunity for crimes motivated by racist and xenophobic attitudes weakens the rule of law and democracy; condemns the persistence and resurgence of neo-Nazism, neo-fascism, and violent nationalist ideologies; recognizes with deep concern the increase in anti-Semitism and Islamophobia in various parts of the world; underlines the key role that political leaders and parties ought to play in combating racism, and encourages political parties to develop codes of

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

conduct, including internal disciplinary measures for violations thereof, so their members refrain from statements and actions that encourage or incite racism. Urges states to ensure that their political and legal systems reflect the multicultural diversity within their societies; and decides to continue consideration of the matter at the next session of the UN General Assembly under the “Elimination of racism and racial discrimination” agenda item.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus on this resolution, which was adopted without a vote. In its statement, the United States applauded the resolution’s recognition of the serious and persistent problem of anti-Semitism, and the equally troubling issue of Islamophobia. It also added that in the United States, even offensive speech is protected, and that it would interpret the reference to party disciplinary measures in a manner consistent with free speech protections under the U.S. Constitution.

#### 10. Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment

**A/Res/58/164**     December 22

Condemns all forms of torture, including through intimidation, as described in Article 1 of the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment; urges governments to take effective measures to provide redress and to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment, including their gender-based manifestations; stresses that under Article 4 of the Convention, torture must be made an offense under domestic criminal law and emphasizes that acts of torture are serious violations of international humanitarian law and that the perpetrators are liable to prosecution and punishment. Urges all states that have not yet done so to become parties to the Convention as a matter of priority; urges states parties to the Convention to comply strictly with their obligations under the Convention; calls upon states parties to consider signing and ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention; invites the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the question of torture to continue to examine questions of torture, and calls upon all governments to cooperate with and assist the Special Rapporteur in the performance of his task.

U.S. Position: The United States successfully sought in the negotiations an amendment of the reference to the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, which the United States does not support because of the ineffective and costly structure it establishes. The United States then co-sponsored and joined consensus on the resolution.

## 11. Scale of Assessments

**A/Res/58/1B**     December 23

Adopts the UN regular scale of assessments for the period 2004-2005. Reaffirms the earlier decision in Resolution 55/5B (2000) that the elements of the scale [the methodology for calculating the scale of assessments] outlined in that resolution will be fixed until 2006.

Notes that the application of the current methodology leads to substantial increases in the rate of assessment of some member states, including developing countries. Emphasizes the need for future scales to reflect the principle that the organization's expenses should be apportioned broadly according to capacity to pay. Requests the Committee on Contributions to continue its consideration of possible systematic criteria for deciding when market exchange rates should be replaced with price-adjusted or other appropriate conversion rates for the purposes of preparing the scale. Also requests the Committee on Contributions to continue to make a thorough analysis of the revised method of calculating price-adjusted rates of exchange.

*Background:* The Fifth (Budget) Committee's recommendations on the scales of assessment were based primarily upon the report of the 63rd session of the Committee on Contributions, in which the scale of assessments for 2004-2006 was recalculated according to the methodology agreed to in 2000, using updated financial data. Other adjustments were made in the course of the Fifth Committee's debate. Because of a number of factors, including improvements in the economic situation of some member states and the full implementation of incremental adjustments during the period 2001-2003, the proposed rates of 71 members increased for 2004-2006, while 58 countries saw decreases. The United States' regular budget assessments for the years 2004, 2005, and 2006 remained capped at 22 percent. This resolution was approved without a vote. The issue of the scale methodology will be revisited in connection with the 61st General Assembly session (2006), where discussion of any changes to the methodology, if needed, will take place.

*U.S. Position:* The United States lobbied vigorously for approval of the Committee's proposed scale of assessments for 2004-2006, as it retained the 22 percent cap on contributions. While in general, UN assessments are based on the idea that the expenses of the organization should be borne by all member states, broadly based on capacity to pay, the United States argued in 2001 that over-reliance on a single member or small group of members was not conducive to the organization's financial health, and the cap was adopted.



## 12. Creation of a Global Culture of Cybersecurity and the Protection of Critical Information Infrastructures

**A/Res/58/199**     December 23

Noting the increasing links among most countries' critical infrastructures and the critical information infrastructures that increasingly interconnect and affect their operations; recognizing that each country will determine its own critical information infrastructures; Noting that critical information infrastructures are now exposed to a growing number and a wider variety of threats and vulnerabilities that raise new security concerns; recognizing that effective protection requires communication and cooperation nationally and internationally among all stakeholders. Takes note of the elements set out in the annex to the present resolution for protecting critical information infrastructures; invites member states and all relevant international organizations to consider, as appropriate, these elements; encourages member states and relevant regional and international organizations that have developed strategies to deal with cyber security and the protection of critical information infrastructures to share their best practices and measures that could assist other member states in their efforts to facilitate the achievement of cyber security.

The resolution identified these steps for protecting critical information infrastructures: (1) have emergency warning networks regarding cyber-vulnerabilities, threats, and incidents; (2) examine infrastructures and identify interdependencies among them, thereby enhancing the protection of such infrastructures; (3) promote partnerships among stakeholders, both public and private, to share and analyze critical infrastructure information in order to prevent, investigate, and respond to damage to or attacks on such infrastructures; (4) facilitate the tracing of attacks on critical information infrastructures and, where appropriate, the disclosure of tracing information to other states; and (5) engage in international cooperation, when appropriate, to secure critical information infrastructures, including by developing and coordinating emergency warning systems; sharing and analyzing information regarding vulnerabilities, threats, and incidents; and coordinating investigations of attacks on such infrastructures in accordance with domestic laws.

*Background:* The United States has sponsored resolutions to address aspects of cyber security in three previous UN General Assemblies. Resolution 57/239 (2002) invited UN member states to create a global culture of cyber security; and Resolutions 55/63 (2000) and 56/121 (2001) established the legal basis for combating the criminal misuse of information technologies. These resolutions all underscored the importance of international cooperation in securing cyberspace. This resolution encourages nations to establish national programs to protect critical information infrastructures by involving all stakeholders, including governments, business, and private citizens. It

### Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003

identifies eleven operational measures based on the elements for protecting critical information infrastructures mentioned above.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution, which highlighted key elements needed for effective cyber security. Protection of interconnected systems requires a global approach, so the United States hopes to build on the momentum of previous UN resolutions concerning cyber security by promoting additional measures to protect cyberspace and the critical infrastructures that rely on information technology.

## 13. Follow-Up to the International Conference on Financing for Development

**A/Res/58/230**     December 23

Recalls paragraph 69 of the Monterrey Consensus and building on the experience of the high-level spring meeting of the Economic and Social Council [ECOSOC] and the High-level Dialogue of the General Assembly in 2003, in the context of the integrated approach to the follow-up to and implementation of the commitments made and agreements reached at the International Conference on Financing for Development; requests the President of ECOSOC to enhance the Council's interactions through regular exchanges with the Bretton Woods institutions, the World Trade Organization, and the UN Conference on Trade and Development on organizational matters related to the follow-up to the International Conference on Financing for Development.

Welcomes the establishment and mandate of the Financing for Development Office of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the Secretariat to (a) organize workshops and multi-stakeholder consultations including experts from public and private sectors as well as academia and civil society to examine issues related to the mobilization of resources for financing development and poverty eradication; and (b) to convene activities involving various stakeholders including the private sector and civil society, as appropriate, to promote best practices and exchange information on the implementation of the commitments made and agreements reached at the Monterrey Consensus.

Background: The International Conference on Financing for Development held in March 2002 broke new ground as a UN development conference. The Consensus final document stressed good governance and the need to mobilize private resources, both domestic and international, in order to achieve economic growth and development. Participants agreed that sustained follow-up within the UN system—including collaboration among the Bretton Woods institutions, World Trade Organization, and other UN bodies—would underscore the importance of implementing proven success strategies as agreed to at the Conference. In 2003, the United States voluntarily contributed \$500,000 to the newly created UN Financing for Development Office,

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

established to provide appropriate secretarial support for sustained follow-up to the Conference.

U.S. Position: The United States participated in the Financing for Development Conference and supported its outcome. In response to requests from the Financing for Development Office for guidance from donors on the direction of its activities, the United States introduced text in this resolution that calls for the participation of experts from the private sector and other relevant stakeholders in workshops, consultations, and other activities to examine issues related to the mobilization of resources for financing development and poverty eradication, as well as the sharing of best practices.

#### 14. Follow-Up to the Outcome of the 26th Special Session: Implementation of the Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS

**A/Res/58/236**     December 23

Notes with profound concern that 42 million people worldwide are living with HIV/AIDS and that the pandemic claimed 3.1 million lives in 2002 and has to date orphaned 14 million children; reaffirms the commitment to the Declaration's goals and urges member states to intensify national efforts and international cooperation in the implementation of the Declaration; and urges intensified efforts to combat the AIDS emergency, including by providing stronger and more visible leadership in response to the pandemic and creating an environment that encourages engagement and partnerships with everyone, including civil society, people living with the disease, marginalized and vulnerable groups, cultural and faith-based organizations, traditional health practitioners, the private sector, media and others, and building and scaling up a comprehensive response to achieve broad, multi-sectoral coverage for prevention, care, treatment and support.

U.S. Position: One of the key U.S. goals for this UNGA session was adoption of a strong resolution on follow-up to the 2001 Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS. Secretary of State Colin Powell and Secretary of Health and Human Services Tommy Thompson participated in a High Level Plenary Session on the subject at the beginning of the 58th GA. The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, signed into law in May 2003, devotes \$15 billion over five years to fight the epidemic in the most affected countries in Africa and the Caribbean

#### 15. The Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects

**A/Res/58/241**     December 23

Decides to convene a UN conference in New York for two weeks in June and July 2006 to review progress made in the implementation of the Program of Action to Prevent, Combat, and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. Determines that it is feasible to develop an

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

international instrument enabling states to identify and trace, in a timely and reliable manner, illicit small arms and light weapons; also notes that the international instrument should be complementary to, and not inconsistent with, the existing commitments of states under other relevant international instruments. Decides to set up an open-ended working group in order to schedule the dates for its substantive sessions; requests the Secretary-General to provide the working group with the assistance and services necessary for the discharge of its tasks; requests the Secretary-General to hold broad-based consultations with all member states, interested regional and sub-regional organizations, international agencies, and experts in the field on eradicating illicit brokering in small arms and light weapons. Requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 59th session on the outcome of his consultations and on the implementation of the present resolution; decides to include in the provisional agenda of its 59th session an item entitled “The illicit trade in small arms and light weapons in all its aspects.”

*U.S. Position:* The United States joined consensus on this resolution after U.S. budgetary concerns were addressed in the General Assembly’s Administrative and Budgetary Committee.

## 16. Situation of Human Rights in Myanmar

**A/Res/58/247**    December 23

Expresses its grave concern at the events of May 30, 2003, the detention and house arrest of Aung San Suu Kyi, the closure of offices of the National League for Democracy and harassment and intimidation of its members, and the lack of cooperation shown by the Government of Myanmar towards the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights; expresses its grave concern at the ongoing systematic violation of human rights of the people of Myanmar, and at large number of internally displaced persons and the flow of refugees to neighboring countries.

Calls upon the Government of Myanmar to initiate a full and independent inquiry, with international cooperation, into the incident of May 30, 2003 and its consequences for the human rights situation in Myanmar, to cooperate fully with the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, and to secure the safe and unhindered access to all parts of Myanmar of UN and humanitarian organizations; strongly urges the Government of Myanmar to end the systematic violations of human rights in Myanmar and to ensure full respect for all human rights and fundamental freedoms, to release Aung San Suu Kyi and other leaders and members of the National League for Democracy, to lift all restraints on peaceful political activity and guarantee freedom of expression, to put an end to impunity, to enhance cooperation with the Special Envoy of the Secretary-General for Myanmar and the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights, to restore democracy, to respect the results of the 1990 elections, and to enter into dialogue with Aung San Suu Kyi; requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 59th session and to the Commission on Human Rights at its

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

60th session on the progress made in the implementation of the present resolution.

U.S. Position: The United States cosponsored this resolution, which was adopted without a vote, although Myanmar disassociated from consensus. In a statement on human rights situations in the Third Committee, the United States called for the Government of Myanmar to immediately and unconditionally release Aung San Suu Kyi and all those imprisoned for the peaceful expression of their political beliefs; to allow the reopening of the offices of the National League for Democracy; and to end the rape, extrajudicial execution, forced labor, conscription of child soldiers, and forced dislocation inflicted on civilians.

### 17. Scale of Assessments for the Apportionment of the Expenses of UN Peacekeeping Operations

**A/Res/58/256**    December 23

Takes note of the report of the Secretary-General and of the updated composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period 2004 to 2006 contained therein; endorses the updated composition of levels of contribution contained in the addendum to the report; requests the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its 61st session on the updating of the composition of levels of contribution for peacekeeping operations for the period 2007 to 2009, in accordance with the provisions of Resolution 55/235.

U.S. Position: The United States supported this resolution, which set new assessments for member states for UN peacekeeping operations, according to the methodology agreed to in the 55th General Assembly, placing the U.S. assessment level at approximately 27 percent.

### 18. Strengthening the United Nations: An Agenda for Further Change

**A/Res/58/269**    December 23

Welcomes the Secretary-General's commitment to strengthening the United Nations, including in the planning, programming, and budgetary process. Requests the Secretary-General to prepare, on a trial basis, a Strategic Framework to replace the current four-year Medium-Term Plan for presentation at the 59th General Assembly in 2004. The Strategic Framework would include two parts: a plan outline of longer-term objectives and a biennial program plan. The Budget Outline would be submitted to the General Assembly for adoption after it has adopted the Strategic Framework. Once approved, the Budget Outline and Strategic Framework will together form the basis for the Secretariat to prepare the proposed program budget.

The Strategic Framework, as the principal policy directive of the United Nations, shall serve as the basis for program planning, budgeting,

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

monitoring, and evaluation. Calls for the General Assembly to review the new budget process at its 62nd session in 2008 and make a final decision at that time on the format, content, and duration of the Strategic Framework as a planning document. Requests the Secretary-General to present a report, through the Committee for Program and Coordination (CPC), on the experiences gained with the new planning and budgetary process.

Among the resolution's key elements with regard to the new budgeting process is the decision to make the program narratives of the program budget clusters identical to the biennial program plan. Therefore, it will no longer be necessary for the CPC to review the budget outline. The CPC, in performing its programmatic role in the planning and budgeting process, will look solely at the programmatic aspects of the budget and any new or revised mandates that may be adopted. The CPC will also look at any differences that may arise between the biennial program plan and the programmatic aspects of the proposed program budget, with respect to new or revised mandates.

Another key element of the resolution is recognition of the need to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation system. It requests the Secretary-General to improve the format and timing of program performance and evaluation reports. It also requests the Secretary-General to seek proposals from the Office of Internal Oversight Services and the Joint Inspection Unit on ways to strengthen the monitoring and evaluation of program performance and evaluation. The Secretary-General will submit a report on these requests at the 60th session of the General Assembly in 2006. The intent is to make evaluation reports an integral part of a system that matches optimal resources to those programs operating effectively and efficiently and to those that need additional resources and actions to improve. It would provide no resources to those outputs or programs that should be terminated.

*Background:* The adoption of this resolution was the culmination of a series of steps that began in 2002 when a number of round-table seminars with regional groups were convened to discuss problems with the current inter-governmental planning and budgeting process. These seminars had resulted in two reports from the Secretary-General in 2003 on how to reform the cumbersome, difficult, and expensive system for planning and producing a UN budget. The budget process was outlined in General Assembly Resolution 41/213, a seminal resolution that was adopted in 1986.

*U.S. Position:* While this resolution made modest changes to General Assembly Resolution 41/213, it represents the first significant step forward to reform the budget process since 1986. The United States expects that synchronizing program planning and financial resource allocation will help produce a much better biennial budget for 2006-2007 and in the years beyond. The United States expects this step to be followed by future incremental measures in an evolutionary process leading to significant changes in the way the UN reviews programs and activities, matches financial resources to

#### IV – General Assembly Important Votes

mandates, identifies high priorities as well as low priorities or obsolete programs, and conducts more effective monitoring and evaluation of programs.

### 19. Program Budget for the Biennium 2004-2005

**A/Res/58/271**     December 23

Approves a new biennium budget that provides \$3.16 billion for proposed program activities for the biennium 2004-2005.

Background: The General Assembly adopted a new biennium budget that met many U.S. priorities. While higher than the previous budget (\$2.96 billion) due, primarily, to the depreciation of the U.S. dollar, the new budget contained numerous reform initiatives and management improvements that were advocated by the United States. The resolution also allotted resources for U.S. priority activities, such as counter-terrorism and special political missions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Cote d'Ivoire, and other locales. The budget included \$8.1 million for servicing of the Counter Terrorism Committee that was not in the Secretary-General's proposed budget. The budget imposed a freeze on most General Service staff to address concerns about high staffing levels despite advances in technology and allotted an extra \$30 million for communications and technology to help update and modernize operating methods of the Secretariat. The budget also provided for reduced spending of about \$2 million for UN Information Centers, which have been targeted for cutbacks and consolidation as part of the effort to modernize UN operations.

Through the budget resolution, the General Assembly authorized the Secretary-General to manage the staffing table on a global basis. Although the mandate was limited to 50 posts on an experimental basis, it sets the stage for broader redeployment of posts among departments of the Secretariat, which should limit the rationale for the creation of new staff jobs in the future. In negotiating the budget numbers, an "Extended Group" of Western countries, representing more than 88 percent of the UN's assessed contributions and including Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and the United States, took a creative approach. They put on the table an early offer in line with their interest in holding down spending, which then became the basis for continued negotiations. As a result of these efforts, the final budget level is about \$50 million less than the \$3.2 billion budget requested by the Secretary-General and showed negligible growth in real terms.

U.S. Position: The United States joined consensus in the Assembly's adoption of the 2004-2005 budget. In the U.S. view, the resulting resolution, together with Resolution 58/269 promoting budget process reform, also adopted in this General Assembly, provided a solid basis for continuing improvements in UN operations.

## COMPARISON WITH U.S. VOTES

The tables that follow summarize UN member state performance at the 58th UNGA in comparison with the United States on the 15 important votes. In these tables, “Identical Votes” is the total number of times the United States and the listed state both voted Yes or No on these issues. “Opposite Votes” is the total number of times the United States voted Yes and the listed state No, or the United States voted No and the listed state Yes. “Abstentions” and “Absences” are totals for the country being compared on these 15 votes. “Voting Coincidence (Votes Only)” is calculated by dividing the number of identical votes by the total of identical and opposite votes. The column headed “Voting Coincidence (Including Consensus)” presents the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States after including the 19 important consensus resolutions as identical votes. The extent of participation was also factored in. (See the second paragraph in this section.)

The first table lists all UN member states in alphabetical order. The second lists them by number of identical votes in descending order; those states with the same number of identical votes are further ranked by the number of opposite votes in ascending order. Countries with the same number of both identical votes and opposite votes are listed alphabetically. Subsequent tables are comparisons of UN members by regional and other groupings to which they belong, again ranked in descending order of identical votes.



*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Afghanistan	3	8	0	4	67.9%	27.3%
Albania	9	3	3	0	90.2%	75.0%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Andorra	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Angola	5	5	3	2	81.4%	50.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Argentina	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Armenia	4	7	2	2	76.4%	36.4%
Australia	10	3	2	0	90.6%	76.9%
Austria	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Azerbaijan	2	11	1	1	64.3%	15.4%
Bahamas	6	7	2	0	77.0%	46.2%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Bangladesh	3	10	2	0	68.6%	23.1%
Barbados	5	6	3	1	78.6%	45.5%
Belarus	2	10	2	1	67.5%	16.7%
Belgium	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Belize	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Benin	3	7	3	2	73.6%	30.0%
Bhutan	4	5	5	1	79.4%	44.4%
Bolivia	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Botswana	3	9	3	0	70.8%	25.0%
Brazil	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Bulgaria	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Burkina Faso	2	8	5	0	71.7%	20.0%
Burundi	3	5	7	0	80.0%	37.5%
Cambodia	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Cameroon	3	5	6	1	79.4%	37.5%
Canada	7	3	5	0	89.7%	70.0%
Cape Verde	3	8	4	0	72.3%	27.3%
Central African Rep.	4	7	3	1	75.1%	36.4%
Chad	0	2	0	13	27.9%	0.0%
Chile	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
China	0	11	4	0	62.9%	0.0%
Colombia	5	7	3	0	77.1%	41.7%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Comoros	1	10	3	1	65.3%	9.1%
Congo	2	6	3	4	73.8%	25.0%
Costa Rica	7	3	4	1	89.5%	70.0%
Cote d'Ivoire	3	8	3	1	72.3%	27.3%
Croatia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Cuba	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Cyprus	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Czech Republic	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
DPR of Korea	1	10	3	1	62.3%	9.1%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	4	2	7	68.2%	33.3%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
Dominica	2	4	3	6	71.7%	33.3%
Dominican Republic	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Ecuador	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
El Salvador	7	2	2	4	92.1%	77.8%
Equatorial Guinea	2	1	1	11	84.6%	66.7%
Eritrea	4	6	3	2	78.7%	40.0%
Estonia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Ethiopia	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Fiji	6	4	5	0	86.0%	60.0%
Finland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
France	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Gabon	3	9	2	1	67.3%	25.0%
Gambia	3	6	0	6	75.7%	33.3%
Georgia	7	3	3	2	89.1%	70.0%
Germany	8	4	3	0	86.9%	66.7%
Ghana	3	7	4	1	75.5%	30.0%
Greece	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Grenada	5	8	2	0	74.5%	38.5%
Guatemala	6	3	6	0	89.3%	66.7%
Guinea	4	8	3	0	73.2%	33.3%
Guinea-Bissau	3	8	3	1	70.9%	27.3%
Guyana	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Haiti	4	8	0	3	72.5%	33.3%
Honduras	5	4	4	2	85.3%	55.6%
Hungary	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Iceland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
India	3	10	2	0	68.8%	23.1%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Iran	2	11	2	0	65.2%	15.4%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**
Ireland	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Israel	13	1	0	1	96.9%	92.9%
Italy	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Jamaica	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Japan	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Kazakhstan	5	6	4	0	79.6%	45.5%
Kenya	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Kiribati	0	1	0	14	16.2%	0.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Kyrgyzstan	4	6	2	3	78.1%	40.0%
Laos	2	7	3	3	72.3%	22.2%
Latvia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Lesotho	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Liberia	0	0	0	15	**	**
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0
Liechtenstein	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Lithuania	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Luxembourg	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Madagascar	4	6	4	1	78.1%	40.0%
Malawi	3	4	4	4	80.6%	42.9%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Maldives	3	9	2	1	70.6%	25.0%
Mali	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Malta	9	5	1	0	84.8%	64.3%
Marshall Islands	12	1	0	2	96.3%	92.3%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Mauritius	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Mexico	6	8	1	0	75.8%	42.9%
Micronesia	11	2	1	1	93.0%	84.6%
Monaco	8	4	3	0	86.3%	66.7%
Mongolia	3	5	5	2	80.9%	37.5%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Mozambique	3	8	3	1	73.2%	27.3%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Namibia	3	9	3	0	70.6%	25.0%
Nauru	9	4	1	1	86.9%	69.2%
Nepal	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Netherlands	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
New Zealand	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Nicaragua	7	4	3	1	86.5%	63.6%
Niger	3	11	1	0	66.1%	21.4%
Nigeria	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Norway	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Pakistan	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Palau	10	0	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Panama	6	7	2	0	78.1%	46.2%
Papua New Guinea	6	4	4	1	85.6%	60.0%
Paraguay	7	7	1	0	78.8%	50.0%
Peru	6	4	5	0	86.1%	60.0%
Philippines	4	8	3	0	74.2%	33.3%
Poland	9	2	3	1	93.2%	81.8%
Portugal	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Republic of Korea	6	4	5	0	86.2%	60.0%
Republic of Moldova	5	4	5	1	85.3%	55.6%
Romania	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Russia	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Rwanda	3	5	6	1	78.6%	37.5%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	1	0	12	78.0%	66.7%
St. Lucia	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	5	5	1	80.5%	44.4%
Samoa	7	4	4	0	85.7%	63.6%
San Marino	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	0	13	58.1%	50.0%
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Senegal	3	10	1	1	68.2%	23.1%
Serbia/Montenegro	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
Seychelles	2	4	0	9	76.0%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	3	6	2	4	72.0%	33.3%
Singapore	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Slovak Republic	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Slovenia	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Alphabetical) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Solomon Islands	5	4	2	4	82.4%	55.6%
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
South Africa	2	9	4	0	69.4%	18.2%
Spain	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Sri Lanka	4	10	1	0	69.7%	28.6%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Suriname	3	8	4	0	72.6%	27.3%
Swaziland	2	6	1	6	70.0%	25.0%
Sweden	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Switzerland	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Tajikistan	5	6	4	0	77.9%	45.5%
Thailand	3	6	6	0	78.6%	33.3%
TFYR Macedonia	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
Timor-Leste	8	5	0	2	82.8%	61.5%
Togo	2	9	2	2	69.6%	18.2%
Tonga	2	5	3	5	78.3%	28.6%
Trinidad and Tobago	4	8	3	0	73.4%	33.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Turkey	4	8	1	2	73.9%	33.3%
Turkmenistan	1	9	1	4	64.2%	10.0%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	6	80.9%	50.0%
Uganda	3	7	3	2	72.3%	30.0%
Ukraine	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Kingdom	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
UR Tanzania	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Uruguay	5	5	5	0	82.5%	50.0%
Uzbekistan	4	1	4	6	94.0%	80.0%
Vanuatu	1	1	1	12	88.6%	50.0%
Venezuela	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Vietnam	0	10	1	4	62.8%	0.0%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Zambia	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Zimbabwe	3	11	1	0	66.3%	21.4%
Average	4.6	6.2	2.9	1.4	78.0%	42.5%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	13	1	0	1	96.9%	92.9%
Marshall Islands	12	1	0	2	96.3%	92.3%
Micronesia	11	2	1	1	93.0%	84.6%
Palau	10	0	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Australia	10	3	2	0	90.6%	76.9%
Poland	9	2	3	1	93.2%	81.8%
Albania	9	3	3	0	90.2%	75.0%
Andorra	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Austria	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Ireland	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Italy	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Norway	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Portugal	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
San Marino	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Slovak Republic	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Spain	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Nauru	9	4	1	1	86.9%	69.2%
Malta	9	5	1	0	84.8%	64.3%
Bosnia-Herzegovina	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Romania	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Serbia/Montenegro	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
TFYR Macedonia	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
Belgium	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Bulgaria	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Croatia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Czech Republic	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Estonia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Finland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
France	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Germany	8	4	3	0	86.9%	66.7%
Greece	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Hungary	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Iceland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Latvia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Lithuania	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Luxembourg	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Monaco	8	4	3	0	86.3%	66.7%
Netherlands	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Slovenia	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
United Kingdom	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Timor-Leste	8	5	0	2	82.8%	61.5%
El Salvador	7	2	2	4	92.1%	77.8%
Canada	7	3	5	0	89.7%	70.0%
Costa Rica	7	3	4	1	89.5%	70.0%
Georgia	7	3	3	2	89.1%	70.0%
Dominican Republic	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Japan	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
New Zealand	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Nicaragua	7	4	3	1	86.5%	63.6%
Samoa	7	4	4	0	85.7%	63.6%
Switzerland	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
Chile	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Cyprus	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Bolivia	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Ecuador	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Paraguay	7	7	1	0	78.8%	50.0%
Guatemala	6	3	6	0	89.3%	66.7%
Fiji	6	4	5	0	86.0%	60.0%
Papua New Guinea	6	4	4	1	85.6%	60.0%
Peru	6	4	5	0	86.1%	60.0%
Republic of Korea	6	4	5	0	86.2%	60.0%
Bahamas	6	7	2	0	77.0%	46.2%
Panama	6	7	2	0	78.1%	46.2%
Mexico	6	8	1	0	75.8%	42.9%
Honduras	5	4	4	2	85.3%	55.6%
Republic of Moldova	5	4	5	1	85.3%	55.6%
Solomon Islands	5	4	2	4	82.4%	55.6%
Angola	5	5	3	2	81.4%	50.0%
Ethiopia	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Ukraine	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Uruguay	5	5	5	0	82.5%	50.0%
Argentina	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Barbados	5	6	3	1	78.6%	45.5%
Kazakhstan	5	6	4	0	79.6%	45.5%
Russia	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Tajikistan	5	6	4	0	77.9%	45.5%
Colombia	5	7	3	0	77.1%	41.7%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Brazil	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Grenada	5	8	2	0	74.5%	38.5%
Venezuela	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Uzbekistan	4	1	4	6	94.0%	80.0%
Bhutan	4	5	5	1	79.4%	44.4%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	5	5	1	80.5%	44.4%
Eritrea	4	6	3	2	78.7%	40.0%
Kyrgyzstan	4	6	2	3	78.1%	40.0%
Madagascar	4	6	4	1	78.1%	40.0%
Antigua-Barbuda	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Armenia	4	7	2	2	76.4%	36.4%
Belize	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Central African Rep.	4	7	3	1	75.1%	36.4%
Nepal	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Nigeria	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Guinea	4	8	3	0	73.2%	33.3%
Guyana	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Haiti	4	8	0	3	72.5%	33.3%
Lesotho	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Mauritius	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Philippines	4	8	3	0	74.2%	33.3%
Trinidad and Tobago	4	8	3	0	73.4%	33.3%
Turkey	4	8	1	2	73.9%	33.3%
Zambia	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Sri Lanka	4	10	1	0	69.7%	28.6%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	6	80.9%	50.0%
Malawi	3	4	4	4	80.6%	42.9%
Burundi	3	5	7	0	80.0%	37.5%
Cameroon	3	5	6	1	79.4%	37.5%
Mongolia	3	5	5	2	80.9%	37.5%
Rwanda	3	5	6	1	78.6%	37.5%
Gambia	3	6	0	6	75.7%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	3	6	2	4	72.0%	33.3%
Thailand	3	6	6	0	78.6%	33.3%
Benin	3	7	3	2	73.6%	30.0%
Ghana	3	7	4	1	75.5%	30.0%
Jamaica	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Singapore	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Uganda	3	7	3	2	72.3%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	8	0	4	67.9%	27.3%



*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Cape Verde	3	8	4	0	72.3%	27.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	3	8	3	1	72.3%	27.3%
Guinea-Bissau	3	8	3	1	70.9%	27.3%
Kenya	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Mozambique	3	8	3	1	73.2%	27.3%
St. Lucia	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Suriname	3	8	4	0	72.6%	27.3%
Botswana	3	9	3	0	70.8%	25.0%
Cambodia	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Gabon	3	9	2	1	67.3%	25.0%
Maldives	3	9	2	1	70.6%	25.0%
Mali	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Namibia	3	9	3	0	70.6%	25.0%
Bangladesh	3	10	2	0	68.6%	23.1%
India	3	10	2	0	68.8%	23.1%
Senegal	3	10	1	1	68.2%	23.1%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Niger	3	11	1	0	66.1%	21.4%
Zimbabwe	3	11	1	0	66.3%	21.4%
Equatorial Guinea	2	1	1	11	84.6%	66.7%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	1	0	12	78.0%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	4	2	7	68.2%	33.3%
Dominica	2	4	3	6	71.7%	33.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	9	76.0%	33.3%
Tonga	2	5	3	5	78.3%	28.6%
Congo	2	6	3	4	73.8%	25.0%
Swaziland	2	6	1	6	70.0%	25.0%
Laos	2	7	3	3	72.3%	22.2%
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	8	5	0	71.7%	20.0%
South Africa	2	9	4	0	69.4%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	2	2	69.6%	18.2%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Belarus	2	10	2	1	67.5%	16.7%
Azerbaijan	2	11	1	1	64.3%	15.4%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Iran	2	11	2	0	65.2%	15.4%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Pakistan	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	0	13	58.1%	50.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**All Countries (Ranked by Identical Votes) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vanuatu	1	1	1	12	88.6%	50.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Turkmenistan	1	9	1	4	64.2%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	3	1	65.3%	9.1%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
DPR of Korea	1	10	3	1	62.3%	9.1%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**
Liberia	0	0	0	15	**	**
Kiribati	0	1	0	14	16.2%	0.0%
Chad	0	2	0	13	27.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	10	1	4	62.8%	0.0%
China	0	11	4	0	62.9%	0.0%
Cuba	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Average	4.6	6.2	2.9	1.4	78.0%	42.5%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

## UN REGIONAL GROUPS

The following tables show the voting coincidence percentage with U.S. votes on the 15 important votes.

### African Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Angola	5	5	3	2	81.4%	50.0%
Ethiopia	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Eritrea	4	6	3	2	78.7%	40.0%
Madagascar	4	6	4	1	78.1%	40.0%
Central African Rep.	4	7	3	1	75.1%	36.4%
Nigeria	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Guinea	4	8	3	0	73.2%	33.3%
Lesotho	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Mauritius	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Zambia	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Malawi	3	4	4	4	80.6%	42.9%
Burundi	3	5	7	0	80.0%	37.5%
Cameroon	3	5	6	1	79.4%	37.5%
Rwanda	3	5	6	1	78.6%	37.5%
Gambia	3	6	0	6	75.7%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	3	6	2	4	72.0%	33.3%
Benin	3	7	3	2	73.6%	30.0%
Ghana	3	7	4	1	75.5%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Uganda	3	7	3	2	72.3%	30.0%
Cape Verde	3	8	4	0	72.3%	27.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	3	8	3	1	72.3%	27.3%
Guinea-Bissau	3	8	3	1	70.9%	27.3%
Kenya	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Mozambique	3	8	3	1	73.2%	27.3%
Botswana	3	9	3	0	70.8%	25.0%
Gabon	3	9	2	1	67.3%	25.0%
Mali	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Namibia	3	9	3	0	70.6%	25.0%
Senegal	3	10	1	1	68.2%	23.1%
Niger	3	11	1	0	66.1%	21.4%
Zimbabwe	3	11	1	0	66.3%	21.4%
Equatorial Guinea	2	1	1	11	84.6%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	4	2	7	68.2%	33.3%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**African Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Seychelles	2	4	0	9	76.0%	33.3%
Congo	2	6	3	4	73.8%	25.0%
Swaziland	2	6	1	6	70.0%	25.0%
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	8	5	0	71.7%	20.0%
South Africa	2	9	4	0	69.4%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	2	2	69.6%	18.2%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	0	13	58.1%	50.0%
Comoros	1	10	3	1	65.3%	9.1%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Chad	0	2	0	13	27.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Liberia	0	0	0	15	**	**
Average	2.6	7.3	2.9	2.2	71.9%	26.2%

**Asian Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Marshall Islands	12	1	0	2	96.3%	92.3%
Micronesia	11	2	1	1	93.0%	84.6%
Palau	10	0	0	5	100.0%	100.0%
Nauru	9	4	1	1	86.9%	69.2%
Timor-Leste	8	5	0	2	82.8%	61.5%
Japan	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
Samoa	7	4	4	0	85.7%	63.6%
Cyprus	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Fiji	6	4	5	0	86.0%	60.0%
Papua New Guinea	6	4	4	1	85.6%	60.0%
Republic of Korea	6	4	5	0	86.2%	60.0%
Solomon Islands	5	4	2	4	82.4%	55.6%
Kazakhstan	5	6	4	0	79.6%	45.5%
Tajikistan	5	6	4	0	77.9%	45.5%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Asian Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Uzbekistan	4	1	4	6	94.0%	80.0%
Bhutan	4	5	5	1	79.4%	44.4%
Kyrgyzstan	4	6	2	3	78.1%	40.0%
Nepal	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Philippines	4	8	3	0	74.2%	33.3%
Sri Lanka	4	10	1	0	69.7%	28.6%
Tuvalu	3	3	3	6	80.9%	50.0%
Mongolia	3	5	5	2	80.9%	37.5%
Thailand	3	6	6	0	78.6%	33.3%
Singapore	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	8	0	4	67.9%	27.3%
Cambodia	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Maldives	3	9	2	1	70.6%	25.0%
Bangladesh	3	10	2	0	68.6%	23.1%
India	3	10	2	0	68.8%	23.1%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Tonga	2	5	3	5	78.3%	28.6%
Laos	2	7	3	3	72.3%	22.2%
Iran	2	11	2	0	65.2%	15.4%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Pakistan	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Vanuatu	1	1	1	12	88.6%	50.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Turkmenistan	1	9	1	4	64.2%	10.0%
DPR of Korea	1	10	3	1	62.3%	9.1%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Kiribati	0	1	0	14	16.2%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	10	1	4	62.8%	0.0%
China	0	11	4	0	62.9%	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Asian Group (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Average	3.3	7.1	2.7	1.9	73.6%	31.9%

**Latin American and Caribbean Group (LAC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
El Salvador	7	2	2	4	92.1%	77.8%
Costa Rica	7	3	4	1	89.5%	70.0%
Dominican Republic	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Nicaragua	7	4	3	1	86.5%	63.6%
Chile	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Bolivia	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Ecuador	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Paraguay	7	7	1	0	78.8%	50.0%
Guatemala	6	3	6	0	89.3%	66.7%
Peru	6	4	5	0	86.1%	60.0%
Bahamas	6	7	2	0	77.0%	46.2%
Panama	6	7	2	0	78.1%	46.2%
Mexico	6	8	1	0	75.8%	42.9%
Honduras	5	4	4	2	85.3%	55.6%
Uruguay	5	5	5	0	82.5%	50.0%
Argentina	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Barbados	5	6	3	1	78.6%	45.5%
Colombia	5	7	3	0	77.1%	41.7%
Brazil	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Grenada	5	8	2	0	74.5%	38.5%
Venezuela	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
St. Vincent/Grenadines	4	5	5	1	80.5%	44.4%
Antigua-Barbuda	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Belize	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Guyana	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Haiti	4	8	0	3	72.5%	33.3%
Trinidad and Tobago	4	8	3	0	73.4%	33.3%
Jamaica	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
St. Lucia	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Suriname	3	8	4	0	72.6%	27.3%
St. Kitts and Nevis	2	1	0	12	78.0%	66.7%
Dominica	2	4	3	6	71.7%	33.3%
Cuba	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Average	4.9	6.1	3.0	0.9	78.7%	44.7%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Western European and Others Group (WEOG)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Israel	13	1	0	1	96.9%	92.9%
Australia	10	3	2	0	90.6%	76.9%
Andorra	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Austria	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Ireland	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Italy	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Norway	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Portugal	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
San Marino	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Spain	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Malta	9	5	1	0	84.8%	64.3%
Belgium	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Finland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
France	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Germany	8	4	3	0	86.9%	66.7%
Greece	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Iceland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Liechtenstein	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Luxembourg	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Monaco	8	4	3	0	86.3%	66.7%
Netherlands	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
United Kingdom	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Canada	7	3	5	0	89.7%	70.0%
New Zealand	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Switzerland	7	4	4	0	86.7%	63.6%
Turkey	4	8	1	2	73.9%	33.3%
Average	8.3	3.7	2.9	0.1	88.0%	69.1%

**Eastern European Group (EE)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Poland	9	2	3	1	93.2%	81.8%
Albania	9	3	3	0	90.2%	75.0%
Slovak Republic	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Bosnia/Herzegovina	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Romania	8	3	4	0	89.9%	72.7%
Serbia/Montenegro	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Eastern European Group (EE) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
TFYR Macedonia	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
Bulgaria	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Croatia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Czech Republic	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Hungary	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Latvia	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Lithuania	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Slovenia	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Georgia	7	3	3	2	89.1%	70.0%
Republic of Moldova	5	4	5	1	85.3%	55.6%
Ukraine	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Russia	5	6	4	0	80.0%	45.5%
Armenia	4	7	2	2	76.4%	36.4%
Belarus	2	10	2	1	67.5%	16.7%
Azerbaijan	2	11	1	1	64.3%	15.4%
Average	6.9	4.5	3.2	0.4	85.1%	60.7%



## OTHER GROUPINGS

The following tables show percentage of voting coincidence with U.S. votes for major groups, in rank order by identical votes.

### Arab Group

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**
Average	0.9	9.9	3.0	1.3	65.3%	8.4%

### Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN)

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTENTIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Philippines	4	8	3	0	74.2%	33.3%
Thailand	3	6	6	0	78.6%	33.3%
Singapore	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Cambodia	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Laos	2	7	3	3	72.3%	22.2%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Vietnam	0	10	1	4	62.8%	0.0%
Average	2.1	9.0	3.1	0.8	69.6%	18.9%

**European Union (EU)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Austria	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Ireland	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Italy	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Portugal	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Spain	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Belgium	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Finland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
France	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Germany	8	4	3	0	86.9%	66.7%
Greece	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Luxembourg	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Netherlands	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
United Kingdom	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Average	8.3	3.7	3.0	0.0	88.2%	69.4%

**Islamic Conference (OIC)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Albania	9	3	3	0	90.2%	75.0%
Kazakhstan	5	6	4	0	79.6%	45.5%
Tajikistan	5	6	4	0	77.9%	45.5%
Uzbekistan	4	1	4	6	94.0%	80.0%
Kyrgyzstan	4	6	2	3	78.1%	40.0%
Nigeria	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Guinea	4	8	3	0	73.2%	33.3%
Guyana	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Turkey	4	8	1	2	73.9%	33.3%
Cameroon	3	5	6	1	79.4%	37.5%
Gambia	3	6	0	6	75.7%	33.3%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Sierra Leone	3	6	2	4	72.0%	33.3%
Benin	3	7	3	2	73.6%	30.0%
Uganda	3	7	3	2	72.3%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	8	0	4	67.9%	27.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	3	8	3	1	72.3%	27.3%
Guinea-Bissau	3	8	3	1	70.9%	27.3%
Mozambique	3	8	3	1	73.2%	27.3%
Suriname	3	8	4	0	72.6%	27.3%
Gabon	3	9	2	1	67.3%	25.0%
Maldives	3	9	2	1	70.6%	25.0%
Mali	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Bangladesh	3	10	2	0	68.6%	23.1%
Senegal	3	10	1	1	68.2%	23.1%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Niger	3	11	1	0	66.1%	21.4%
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	8	5	0	71.7%	20.0%
Togo	2	9	2	2	69.6%	18.2%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Azerbaijan	2	11	1	1	64.3%	15.4%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Iran	2	11	2	0	65.2%	15.4%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Pakistan	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Turkmenistan	1	9	1	4	64.2%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	3	1	65.3%	9.1%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Chad	0	2	0	13	27.9%	0.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Islamic Conference (OIC) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**
Average	0.7	2.5	0.8	0.4	69.3%	20.8%

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Malta	9	5	1	0	84.8%	64.3%
Serbia/Montenegro	8	3	4	0	90.0%	72.7%
Dominican Republic	7	4	4	0	86.6%	63.6%
Nicaragua	7	4	3	1	86.5%	63.6%
Chile	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Cyprus	7	5	3	0	83.9%	58.3%
Bolivia	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Ecuador	7	7	1	0	78.7%	50.0%
Guatemala	6	3	6	0	89.3%	66.7%
Papua New Guinea	6	4	4	1	85.6%	60.0%
Peru	6	4	5	0	86.1%	60.0%
Bahamas	6	7	2	0	77.0%	46.2%
Panama	6	7	2	0	78.1%	46.2%
Honduras	5	4	4	2	85.3%	55.6%
Angola	5	5	3	2	81.4%	50.0%
Ethiopia	5	5	5	0	82.6%	50.0%
Barbados	5	6	3	1	78.6%	45.5%
Colombia	5	7	3	0	77.1%	41.7%
Grenada	5	8	2	0	74.5%	38.5%
Venezuela	5	8	2	0	75.0%	38.5%
Uzbekistan	4	1	4	6	94.0%	80.0%
Bhutan	4	5	5	1	79.4%	44.4%
Eritrea	4	6	3	2	78.7%	40.0%
Madagascar	4	6	4	1	78.1%	40.0%
Belize	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Central African Rep.	4	7	3	1	75.1%	36.4%
Nepal	4	7	4	0	76.5%	36.4%
Nigeria	4	7	4	0	76.7%	36.4%
Guinea	4	8	3	0	73.2%	33.3%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Guyana	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Lesotho	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Mauritius	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Philippines	4	8	3	0	74.2%	33.3%
Trinidad and Tobago	4	8	3	0	73.4%	33.3%
Zambia	4	8	3	0	74.0%	33.3%
Sri Lanka	4	10	1	0	69.7%	28.6%
Malawi	3	4	4	4	80.6%	42.9%
Burundi	3	5	7	0	80.0%	37.5%
Cameroon	3	5	6	1	79.4%	37.5%
Mongolia	3	5	5	2	80.9%	37.5%
Rwanda	3	5	6	1	78.6%	37.5%
Gambia	3	6	0	6	75.7%	33.3%
Sierra Leone	3	6	2	4	72.0%	33.3%
Thailand	3	6	6	0	78.6%	33.3%
Benin	3	7	3	2	73.6%	30.0%
Ghana	3	7	4	1	75.5%	30.0%
Jamaica	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Singapore	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
UR Tanzania	3	7	5	0	75.9%	30.0%
Uganda	3	7	3	2	72.3%	30.0%
Afghanistan	3	8	0	4	67.9%	27.3%
Cape Verde	3	8	4	0	72.3%	27.3%
Cote d'Ivoire	3	8	3	1	72.3%	27.3%
Guinea-Bissau	3	8	3	1	70.9%	27.3%
Kenya	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Mozambique	3	8	3	1	73.2%	27.3%
St. Lucia	3	8	4	0	73.2%	27.3%
Suriname	3	8	4	0	72.6%	27.3%
Botswana	3	9	3	0	70.8%	25.0%
Cambodia	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Gabon	3	9	2	1	67.3%	25.0%
Maldives	3	9	2	1	70.6%	25.0%
Mali	3	9	3	0	71.0%	25.0%
Namibia	3	9	3	0	70.6%	25.0%
Bangladesh	3	10	2	0	68.6%	23.1%
India	3	10	2	0	68.8%	23.1%
Senegal	3	10	1	1	68.2%	23.1%
Indonesia	3	11	1	0	66.7%	21.4%
Niger	3	11	1	0	66.1%	21.4%
Zimbabwe	3	11	1	0	66.3%	21.4%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Equatorial Guinea	2	1	1	11	84.6%	66.7%
Dem. Rep. Congo	2	4	2	7	68.2%	33.3%
Seychelles	2	4	0	9	76.0%	33.3%
Congo	2	6	3	4	73.8%	25.0%
Swaziland	2	6	1	6	70.0%	25.0%
Laos	2	7	3	3	72.3%	22.2%
Somalia	2	7	3	3	71.0%	22.2%
Burkina Faso	2	8	5	0	71.7%	20.0%
South Africa	2	9	4	0	69.4%	18.2%
Togo	2	9	2	2	69.6%	18.2%
Algeria	2	10	3	0	67.7%	16.7%
Belarus	2	10	2	1	67.5%	16.7%
Egypt	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Iran	2	11	2	0	65.2%	15.4%
Malaysia	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Pakistan	2	11	2	0	65.6%	15.4%
Sao Tome/Principe	1	1	0	13	58.1%	50.0%
Vanuatu	1	1	1	12	88.6%	50.0%
Kuwait	1	9	3	2	67.9%	10.0%
Turkmenistan	1	9	1	4	64.2%	10.0%
Comoros	1	10	3	1	65.3%	9.1%
Djibouti	1	10	3	1	66.2%	9.1%
DPR of Korea	1	10	3	1	62.3%	9.1%
Morocco	1	10	4	0	66.7%	9.1%
Sudan	1	10	3	1	66.4%	9.1%
Bahrain	1	11	3	0	64.1%	8.3%
Brunei Darussalam	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Jordan	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Lebanon	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Mauritania	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Oman	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Qatar	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Tunisia	1	11	3	0	64.3%	8.3%
Yemen	1	11	3	0	64.5%	8.3%
Chad	0	2	0	13	27.9%	0.0%
Libya	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Myanmar (Burma)	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
United Arab Emirates	0	10	4	1	65.0%	0.0%
Vietnam	0	10	1	4	62.8%	0.0%
Cuba	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Saudi Arabia	0	11	3	1	62.4%	0.0%
Syria	0	11	4	0	62.6%	0.0%
Iraq	0	0	0	15	**	**
Liberia	0	0	0	15	**	**
Average	3.0	7.5	2.9	1.6	72.7%	28.5%

**Nordic Group**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Norway	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Finland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Iceland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Sweden	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Average	8.2	3.8	3.0	0.0	87.7%	68.3%

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Poland	9	2	3	1	93.2%	81.8%
Italy	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Norway	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Portugal	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Spain	9	3	3	0	90.3%	75.0%
Belgium	8	4	3	0	87.0%	66.7%
Czech Republic	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Denmark	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
France	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Germany	8	4	3	0	86.9%	66.7%
Greece	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Hungary	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Iceland	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Luxembourg	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Netherlands	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
United Kingdom	8	4	3	0	87.1%	66.7%
Canada	7	3	5	0	89.7%	70.0%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	ABSTEN- TIONS	ABSENCES	VOTING COINCIDENCE INCLUDING CONSENSUS	VOTES ONLY
Turkey	4	8	1	2	73.9%	33.3%
Average	8.0	3.8	3.0	0.2	87.5%	67.6%

## COMPARISON OF IMPORTANT AND OVERALL VOTES

The following table shows the percentage of voting coincidence with the United States in 2003 for both important votes and all Plenary votes, in a side-by-side comparison.

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Afghanistan.....	3	8	27.3%	11	51	17.7%
Albania .....	9	3	75.0%	31	32	49.2%
Algeria .....	2	10	16.7%	9	68	11.7%
Andorra.....	9	3	75.0%	28	40	41.2%
Angola .....	5	5	50.0%	16	55	22.5%
Antigua-Barbuda .....	4	7	36.4%	14	64	17.9%
Argentina .....	5	6	45.5%	17	53	24.3%
Armenia .....	4	7	36.4%	16	54	22.9%
Australia .....	10	3	76.9%	36	26	58.1%
Austria .....	9	3	75.0%	29	40	42.0%
Azerbaijan.....	2	11	15.4%	11	59	15.7%
Bahamas .....	6	7	46.2%	17	57	23.0%
Bahrain .....	1	11	8.3%	8	68	10.5%
Bangladesh .....	3	10	23.1%	13	67	16.3%
Barbados .....	5	6	45.5%	11	58	15.9%
Belarus.....	2	10	16.7%	12	60	16.7%
Belgium .....	8	4	66.7%	31	36	46.3%
Belize.....	4	7	36.4%	15	65	18.8%
Benin .....	3	7	30.0%	12	56	17.6%
Bhutan .....	4	5	44.4%	9	44	17.0%
Bolivia .....	7	7	50.0%	18	63	22.2%
Bosnia/Herzegovina.....	8	3	72.7%	29	38	43.3%
Botswana .....	3	9	25.0%	13	64	16.9%
Brazil .....	5	8	38.5%	16	61	20.8%
Brunei Darussalam .....	1	11	8.3%	12	68	15.0%
Bulgaria .....	8	4	66.7%	31	37	45.6%
Burkina Faso.....	2	8	20.0%	9	65	12.2%
Burundi.....	3	5	37.5%	12	52	18.8%
Cambodia.....	3	9	25.0%	13	67	16.3%



*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Cameroon .....	3	5	37.5%	10	45	18.2%
Canada .....	7	3	70.0%	31	33	48.4%
Cape Verde .....	3	8	27.3%	11	65	14.5%
Central African Rep.....	4	7	36.4%	14	56	20.0%
Chad.....	0	2	0.0%	0	4	0.0%
Chile .....	7	5	58.3%	19	60	24.1%
China .....	0	11	0.0%	10	66	13.2%
Colombia .....	5	7	41.7%	15	60	20.0%
Comoros .....	1	10	9.1%	8	67	10.7%
Congo .....	2	6	25.0%	12	53	18.5%
Costa Rica.....	7	3	70.0%	19	52	26.8%
Cote d'Ivoire.....	3	8	27.3%	10	64	13.5%
Croatia .....	8	4	66.7%	28	37	43.1%
Cuba.....	0	11	0.0%	6	67	8.2%
Cyprus .....	7	5	58.3%	26	46	36.1%
Czech Republic.....	8	4	66.7%	30	35	46.2%
Dem. Rep. of the Congo ...	2	4	33.3%	9	19	32.1%
DPR of Korea .....	1	10	9.1%	6	59	9.2%
Denmark .....	8	4	66.7%	31	38	44.9%
Djibouti.....	1	10	9.1%	9	68	11.7%
Dominica .....	2	4	33.3%	8	27	22.9%
Dominican Republic.....	7	4	63.6%	18	54	25.0%
Ecuador.....	7	7	50.0%	17	65	20.7%
Egypt .....	2	11	15.4%	10	68	12.8%
El Salvador .....	7	2	77.8%	17	44	27.9%
Equatorial Guinea.....	2	1	66.7%	2	11	15.4%
Eritrea .....	4	6	40.0%	14	61	18.7%
Estonia .....	8	4	66.7%	29	37	43.9%
Ethiopia .....	5	5	50.0%	15	62	19.5%
Fiji .....	6	4	60.0%	16	54	22.9%
Finland.....	8	4	66.7%	30	38	44.1%
France .....	8	4	66.7%	36	35	50.7%
Gabon .....	3	9	25.0%	12	57	17.4%
Gambia .....	3	6	33.3%	13	55	19.1%
Georgia .....	7	3	70.0%	24	27	47.1%
Germany .....	8	4	66.7%	31	35	47.0%
Ghana.....	3	7	30.0%	13	63	17.1%
Greece.....	8	4	66.7%	29	40	42.0%
Grenada.....	5	8	38.5%	15	64	19.0%
Guatemala.....	6	3	66.7%	17	53	24.3%
Guinea .....	4	8	33.3%	12	61	16.4%
Guinea-Bissau.....	3	8	27.3%	9	58	13.4%
Guyana.....	4	8	33.3%	15	65	18.8%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Haiti.....	4	8	33.3%	11	64	14.7%
Honduras.....	5	4	55.6%	16	44	26.7%
Hungary.....	8	4	66.7%	30	37	44.8%
Iceland.....	8	4	66.7%	30	37	44.8%
India.....	3	10	23.1%	14	57	19.7%
Indonesia.....	3	11	21.4%	14	69	16.9%
Iran.....	2	11	15.4%	9	68	11.7%
Iraq.....	0	0	**	0	0	**
Ireland.....	9	3	75.0%	28	43	39.4%
Israel.....	13	1	92.9%	61	7	89.7%
Italy.....	9	3	75.0%	32	39	45.1%
Jamaica.....	3	7	30.0%	14	64	17.9%
Japan.....	7	4	63.6%	26	40	39.4%
Jordan.....	1	11	8.3%	9	69	11.5%
Kazakhstan.....	5	6	45.5%	15	52	22.4%
Kenya.....	3	8	27.3%	11	64	14.7%
Kiribati.....	0	1	0.0%	0	1	0.0%
Kuwait.....	1	9	10.0%	10	66	13.2%
Kyrgyzstan.....	4	6	40.0%	13	54	19.4%
Laos.....	2	7	22.2%	10	62	13.9%
Latvia.....	8	4	66.7%	30	38	44.1%
Lebanon.....	1	11	8.3%	8	67	10.7%
Lesotho.....	4	8	33.3%	14	66	17.5%
Liberia.....	0	0	**	0	0	**
Libya.....	0	10	0.0%	8	67	10.7%
Liechtenstein.....	8	4	66.7%	27	40	40.3%
Lithuania.....	8	4	66.7%	31	37	45.6%
Luxembourg.....	8	4	66.7%	31	37	45.6%
Madagascar.....	4	6	40.0%	12	58	17.1%
Malawi.....	3	4	42.9%	10	44	18.5%
Malaysia.....	2	11	15.4%	14	68	17.1%
Maldives.....	3	9	25.0%	14	66	17.5%
Mali.....	3	9	25.0%	14	68	17.1%
Malta.....	9	5	64.3%	29	44	39.7%
Marshall Islands.....	12	1	92.3%	48	13	78.7%
Mauritania.....	1	11	8.3%	7	69	9.2%
Mauritius.....	4	8	33.3%	13	64	16.9%
Mexico.....	6	8	42.9%	17	65	20.7%
Micronesia.....	11	2	84.6%	50	11	82.0%
Monaco.....	8	4	66.7%	31	36	46.3%
Mongolia.....	3	5	37.5%	14	60	18.9%
Morocco.....	1	10	9.1%	8	68	10.5%
Mozambique.....	3	8	27.3%	13	66	16.5%

*IV – General Assembly Important Votes*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Myanmar (Burma) .....	0	10	0.0%	9	65	12.2%
Namibia .....	3	9	25.0%	13	66	16.5%
Nauru .....	9	4	69.2%	25	40	38.5%
Nepal .....	4	7	36.4%	14	65	17.7%
Netherlands .....	8	4	66.7%	31	38	44.9%
New Zealand .....	7	4	63.6%	27	43	38.6%
Nicaragua .....	7	4	63.6%	18	52	25.7%
Niger .....	3	11	21.4%	12	67	15.2%
Nigeria .....	4	7	36.4%	16	65	19.8%
Norway .....	9	3	75.0%	31	36	46.3%
Oman .....	1	11	8.3%	9	68	11.7%
Pakistan .....	2	11	15.4%	14	64	17.9%
Palau .....	10	0	100.0%	33	1	97.1%
Panama .....	6	7	46.2%	17	65	20.7%
Papua New Guinea .....	6	4	60.0%	17	42	28.8%
Paraguay .....	7	7	50.0%	18	60	23.1%
Peru .....	6	4	60.0%	17	57	23.0%
Philippines .....	4	8	33.3%	14	65	17.7%
Poland .....	9	2	81.8%	34	34	50.0%
Portugal .....	9	3	75.0%	31	36	46.3%
Qatar .....	1	11	8.3%	9	69	11.5%
Republic of Korea .....	6	4	60.0%	23	37	38.3%
Republic of Moldova .....	5	4	55.6%	20	36	35.7%
Romania .....	8	3	72.7%	28	39	41.8%
Russia .....	5	6	45.5%	19	53	26.4%
Rwanda .....	3	5	37.5%	8	36	18.2%
St. Kitts and Nevis .....	2	1	66.7%	2	4	33.3%
St. Lucia .....	3	8	27.3%	13	66	16.5%
St. Vincent/Grenadines .....	4	5	44.4%	11	52	17.5%
Samoa .....	7	4	63.6%	15	46	24.6%
San Marino .....	9	3	75.0%	28	40	41.2%
Sao Tome and Principe .....	1	1	50.0%	1	1	50.0%
Saudi Arabia .....	0	11	0.0%	7	67	9.5%
Senegal .....	3	10	23.1%	15	66	18.5%
Serbia/Montenegro .....	8	3	72.7%	28	39	41.8%
Seychelles .....	2	4	33.3%	8	41	16.3%
Sierra Leone .....	3	6	33.3%	12	40	23.1%
Singapore .....	3	7	30.0%	15	61	19.7%
Slovak Republic .....	9	3	75.0%	30	37	44.8%
Slovenia .....	8	4	66.7%	29	39	42.6%
Solomon Islands .....	5	4	55.6%	13	37	26.0%
Somalia .....	2	7	22.2%	9	53	14.5%
South Africa .....	2	9	18.2%	11	63	14.9%

*Voting Practices in the United Nations – 2003*

**Comparison of Important and Overall Votes (Cont'd)**

COUNTRY	IMPORTANT VOTES			OVERALL VOTES		
	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT	IDENTICAL VOTES	OPPOSITE VOTES	PERCENT
Spain.....	9	3	75.0%	30	36	45.5%
Sri Lanka .....	4	10	28.6%	15	67	18.3%
Sudan .....	1	10	9.1%	10	66	13.2%
Suriname.....	3	8	27.3%	14	62	18.4%
Swaziland .....	2	6	25.0%	8	43	15.7%
Sweden .....	8	4	66.7%	29	40	42.0%
Switzerland.....	7	4	63.6%	28	37	43.1%
Syria.....	0	11	0.0%	7	66	9.6%
Tajikistan.....	5	6	45.5%	15	46	24.6%
Thailand.....	3	6	33.3%	13	61	17.6%
TFYR Macedonia .....	8	3	72.7%	28	37	43.1%
Timor-Leste .....	8	5	61.5%	15	57	20.8%
Togo.....	2	9	18.2%	12	66	15.4%
Tonga.....	2	5	28.6%	13	40	24.5%
Trinidad and Tobago .....	4	8	33.3%	14	62	18.4%
Tunisia .....	1	11	8.3%	8	67	10.7%
Turkey .....	4	8	33.3%	23	48	32.4%
Turkmenistan.....	1	9	10.0%	9	59	13.2%
Tuvalu.....	3	3	50.0%	8	22	26.7%
Uganda.....	3	7	30.0%	14	49	22.2%
Ukraine .....	5	5	50.0%	19	48	28.4%
United Arab Emirates .....	0	10	0.0%	8	66	10.8%
United Kingdom .....	8	4	66.7%	40	30	57.1%
UR Tanzania.....	3	7	30.0%	16	64	20.0%
Uruguay.....	5	5	50.0%	16	55	22.5%
Uzbekistan .....	4	1	80.0%	13	21	38.2%
Vanuatu .....	1	1	50.0%	7	18	28.0%
Venezuela .....	5	8	38.5%	15	66	18.5%
Vietnam .....	0	10	0.0%	6	67	8.2%
Yemen .....	1	11	8.3%	9	69	11.5%
Zambia.....	4	8	33.3%	14	65	17.7%
Zimbabwe.....	3	11	21.4%	14	67	17.3%
Average.....	4.6	6.2	42.5%	17.1	50.0	25.5%